

as the Hinebaugh bill, proposing the enactment of legislation which will compel concerns selling goods directly to the consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, county, and State into which said goods are shipped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 7074, for the relief of Emma S. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8545, for the relief of Rebecca Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 6579, for the relief of Amy Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Gardner, Ill., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grand Lodge of the German Order of Harn-gair, of Illinois, favoring an embargo on shipment of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Boston Post Office Clerks' Association, Branch No. 5, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, favoring House bills 7654 and 7655, to retire postal employees and to prohibit the discharge of the employees of the Postal Service for certain disabilities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Stork Bros., hosiery manufacturers, of Adams-town, Pa., favoring protection for manufacturers of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of library committees in session at Chicago, Ill., asking that libraries be exempted from the provisions of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Griffin Button Co., of Shelton, Conn.; New England Cotton Yarn Co., of New Bedford, Mass.; Phoenix Underwear Co., of Little Falls, N. Y.; Knoxville (Tenn.) Spinning Co.; Elk Cotton Mills, of Dalton, Ga.; H. R. Epler & Sons, of Reading, Pa.; Anniston (Ala.) Yarn Mills; and E. C. Beeten & Sons, of Carlisle, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 8423, for the relief of Robert F. Risley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9848, granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9474, granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers in support of claim for special pension for Jennie J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Irene L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Gorham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring appropriation for Government work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOUD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., favoring Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of M. G. Esch, John H. Gerth, Joseph Hecking, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: Petitions of James Devlin and Henry J. Heitman, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Gilbert S. Graves and 44 citizens of Oswego, N. Y., favoring national censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of F. N. Darling and 31 citizens of Cazenovia, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of J. Broadbent & Son, of Connecticut, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Lees Button Co., of Leominster; Shiverffs Worsted Co. and Star Worsted Co., of Fitchburg; and Aetna Mills, of Watertown, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petitions of sundry citizens of Middleton, N. Y., protesting against tax on tooth paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Baldwin Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elmira, N. Y., advocating preparedness, the protection of our citizens, and the honor of our flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petitions of Kalamazoo Amusement Co. and Koch & Buchter Orpheum Theater Co., of Kalamazoo; and Wonderland Theater, of Vicksburg, Mich., protesting against Federal censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of A. J. Brosseau, of Albion, Mich., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of C. Moore Co., of Westerly, R. I., favoring the passage of the bill to encourage and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of F. E. Spencer, of Guilford, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. A. Watts, of New Haven, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 8435—1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petitions of theaters of the United States, relative to equitable distribution of any tax the present Congress may levy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we know that every path of human activity leads to Thy throne. We have never been able to get away from the consciousness of human responsibility. Thou hast taught us to look forward to the judgment of our own lives without fear. Thou hast taught us that our lives will be in review before Thee. The ideals that we seek to work into the plan of human life and government are derived from Thee, and that which we write into law must stand the test of the divine law. Grant us Thy grace to see the larger meaning of life and law in the light of Thy life and of Thy law. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 255).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to \$47,525.33 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under provisions the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, submitted by the Attorney General, and which require an appropriation for their payment, etc., amounting to \$5,006.89 (S. Doc. No. 253), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$27,695.12, which have been presented to the department and require an appropriation for their payment (S. Doc. No. 252), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a communication from the General Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, transmitting a tabulation of a referendum vote on the question of making a marked increase in the development of the foreign commercial service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce and the Consular Service in the Department of State, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition from the city and county officials of Montana, in convention assembled, praying for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Flathead Reclamation project in that State. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures of the chairman and the secretary, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

The city officials, county assessors, county commissioners, county clerks and recorders, county treasurers, county surveyors, and county auditors of all the cities and counties of this State, in joint convention assembled at Butte, Mont., most urgently request the President and the Congress of the United States for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for construction work on the Flathead irrigation project, to be passed by this session of Congress for work during the current year.

The estimated cost for this project is \$6,500,000, and Government reports show that the project is less than 25 per cent completed, and at the present rate of receiving appropriations it will require 25 years to complete the project.

The settlers entered upon these lands at the urgent request of the Government, under promise that their lands would be irrigated and opportunity afforded them to provide a living for their families and make payments on their land.

The dilatory methods of the Government in handling this project has been manifestly unfair, and they feel that the Government should come to their assistance and make appropriations that will assure completion of the project in an economical and businesslike manner, thereby insuring water at an early date and greatly reducing the cost per acre of this project. The lax methods of the Government are resulting in the absolute confiscation of the settlers' rights and property.

In view of the foregoing facts, we do most urgently request that a large appropriation looking toward the speedy and economical completion of this project be passed by this session of Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVE KEHOE, *Chairman.*
ROBT. LEAVENS, *Secretary.*

Dated at Butte, Mont., January 18, 1916.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Newark, Del., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stanton, Del., praying for an investigation of the so-called foot-and-mouth disease and for the reimbursement of cattle exhibitors at the National Dairy Show, Chicago, Ill., for losses sustained, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Emerson Paper Co., of Wendell, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARDING presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the ratification of the Nicaraguan Canal option treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying that appropriations be made for the improvement of the Ohio and Scioto Rivers, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Olmsted, Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of Massillon, Ohio, and a petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations as a public document, which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, remonstrating against an increase of the tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed reorganization of the Rural Free Delivery Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Marion National Mill Co., of Marion, Ohio, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called mixed-flour law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Olmsted, Ohio, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Friends of Flushing, Ohio, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Olmsted, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation making it a misdemeanor to put fraudulent statements as to contents of bottles and packages of medicine, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GRONNA. I have some letters from farmers in my State, one from Fred Kraft, of Enderlin, N. Dak., which calls attention to the monopoly now existing in twine.

I also have a letter from Victor A. Rendon, general attorney for the Commission Reguladora del Mercado de Hennequin, which relates to this same question.

I ask that these letters be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask this reference because a resolution was referred to that committee for report with reference to an investigation whether there is a combination controlling the price of sisal and binder twine.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry United Spanish War Veterans of Austin, Minn., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the State Normal School, of Mankato, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Society of Blue Earth, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the high cost of drugs and chemicals necessary in the treatment of the sick and injured, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oswego and Albany, in the State of New York, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LIPPITT presented petitions of the Rhode Island Textile Co., of Robert D. Mason Co., and of the Rhode Island Card Board Co., all of Pawtucket; of the W. & K. Co., the Waterhouse Worsted Co., the Franklin Process Co., and the Colwell Worsted Mills, all of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRYAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Orlando, Miami, Coconut Grove, Zellwood, and Lake Helen, all in the State of Florida, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Meade, Fla., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Meade, Fla., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HUGHES presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Paul Revere Club, of Camden, N. J., praying for the placing of an embargo on the exportation of munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 66) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 539) for the relief of Thomas F. Veno, submitted an adverse report (No. 67) thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was recommitted the bill (H. R. 562) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a Postal Savings System, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 65) thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2408) to prevent usury, provide penalties for its violation, and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which was agreed to.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 6 to pay Letitia D. Maxham, widow of Azro J. Maxham, a sum equal to six months' salary, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 46, authorizing the Committee on Woman Suffrage to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 49, authorizing the Committee on Appropriations or any subcommittee thereof to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 63, authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 69, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 73 authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 74 authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 75 authorizing the Secretary of the Senate to pay to Mary Meyer, niece of Jacob C. Donaldson, late a skilled laborer in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, etc., reported it without amendment.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 70 submitted by Mr. OVERMAN on the 17th instant authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ a stenographer to report hearings, etc., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back

favorably Senate resolution No. 78 authorizing the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals to employ a stenographer temporarily, and I call the attention of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] to the report.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals be authorized to employ a stenographer temporarily and that the said stenographer be paid at the rate of \$50 per month for each day of such employment, not exceeding four months, and that such services be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

INDIAN ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. JONES. On yesterday I introduced a bill, being Senate bill 3774, to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses agreement of July 7, 1883, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3911) granting a pension to Sarah R. Naylor;

A bill (S. 3912) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pletcher;

A bill (S. 3913) granting a pension to Joseph F. Bartini;

A bill (S. 3914) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Eyer;

A bill (S. 3915) granting a pension to W. H. Deistine, sr.;

A bill (S. 3916) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Driggs;

A bill (S. 3917) granting an increase of pension to Charles Brown;

A bill (S. 3918) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Law;

A bill (S. 3919) granting an increase of pension to John Williams; and

A bill (S. 3920) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah B. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3921) for the relief of W. S. Hosack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3922) authorizing and directing the managers of the soldiers' homes to designate and set aside one of the homes for the exclusive use of the widows of soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 3923) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3924) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Roach; and

A bill (S. 3925) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 3926) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David H. Hartson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3927) for the relief of the legal representatives of Francis Busch, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3928) to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3929) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3930) for the relief of Mary L. Butland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3931) for the relief of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Arkansas; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3932) to authorize the employment of persons in the District of Columbia and in the field and other necessary expenses in the administration of the national parks and the Hot Springs Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 3933) to reimburse the Navajo Lumber & Timber Co., of Arizona, for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; and

A bill (S. 3934) to reimburse the Navajo Timber Co., of Delaware, for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3935) granting a pension to Ella C. Moody (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3936) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ballinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 3937) providing for the setting aside of certain lands within the Coronado National Forest for the use and benefit of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3938) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 3939) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca R. Potter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3940) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Chapman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3941) granting a pension to Flora Sroufe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3942) to correct the military record of Stephen A. West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 3943) granting an increase of pension to Rosa L. Tobin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3944) granting an increase of pension to Sophia E. Bissonett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3945) to protect the public against dishonest advertising and false pretenses in merchandising; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 3946) to establish a Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3947) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, to prevent overissues of securities by carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3948) for the improvement of the Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.; to the Committee on Commerce.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I submit a proposed amendment to the so-called Philippine bill (S. 381), which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Add a new section, properly numbered, as follows:

"Sec. —. The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, three commissioners to cooperate with the Philippine Legislature in preparing and submitting a constitution or plan of government for the people of the Philippine Islands as an independent nation. The constitution or plan shall be one best adapted to protect and preserve the rights and liberties of the people of the Islands and most likely to be efficient in maintaining law and order and in promoting progress and prosperity.

"Among other things, it shall provide for the complete possession and sovereignty on the part of the United States, in perpetuity, of such coaling stations and naval bases as may be prescribed by the President of the United States. The said constitution or plan of government shall be prepared by the Philippine Legislature and submitted to the said commissioners, and if approved by the said commissioners, or a majority of them, and adopted by the said legislature, it shall then be submitted to the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands for approval or rejection at an election to be appointed by the Philippine Legislature after not less than four months' notice.

"If a majority of the electors voting at said election shall approve the said constitution or plan of government and thereby indicate their desire for complete separation from the United States, as well as their approval of the particular constitution or plan, the said Philippine Legislature shall proceed to the establishment of the government so authorized, and when it is ready to assume the full government of the islands the President of the United States shall withdraw the military force of this country and all the representatives of this Government and thereafter shall treat the government so established in the Philippine Islands as a separate and independent government, and the relation of the United States toward such government shall thereafter be the relation which is sustained toward all other foreign powers."

AMENDMENTS TO URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for commencement of a post-office build-

ing at Fordyce, Ark., from \$500 to \$10,000, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the commencement of a post-office building at Mena, Ark., from \$500 to \$10,000, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Resolved, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1915 for the use of the Senate document room.

THE ATLANTIC FLEET IN 1915 (S. DOC. NO. 251).

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that Executive Document B of the Senate, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "The Atlantic Fleet in 1915," be printed as a public document. The injunction of secrecy was removed two or three days ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN ON PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 254).

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present a speech by William J. Bryan on prohibition, which I regard as one of the best discussions of the subject I have ever seen. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Texas ask to have it printed as a public document or in the RECORD?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not believe we ought to put so many speeches in the RECORD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing with a view to its publication as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator desires to ask that it shall be printed as a public document, I have no objection to making that order now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed as a public document, then.

FLOOD AT YUMA, ARIZ.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I introduce a joint resolution, which I should like to have the Secretary read, as I purpose to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas a flood in the Gila River has destroyed the levee erected by the Government at the town of Yuma, Ariz.; and
Whereas the waters from said river are overflowing the said town and destroying the property of its citizens; and
Whereas the waters of said flood are now 5 feet or more in depth over the business center of said town; and
Whereas the said flood waters, if not quickly restrained, will ruin the people and now threatens to ruin the Government irrigation project at said city: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the repair and rebuilding of said levee; that said sum shall be immediately available and the work shall be done and money expended by the director of the irrigation project stationed at said town or by any engineer detailed at once by the Secretary of War for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The joint resolution has not been to a committee?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; it has never been referred. I will state to the Senator that I received only yesterday evening a telegram from the mayor of Yuma. I wish the Secretary would read the telegram for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

YUMA, ARIZ., January 21, 1916.

Senator MARK SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Government levee built 25 years ago for protection of Yuma broken by floods. Business section of town under 5 feet of water. More than half of the buildings collapsed and great distress and loss to every inhabitant here. Please procure immediately \$50,000 for reconstruction of good levee. Kindly answer by wire what you can and will do for

Immediate action. This levee is not under the jurisdiction of the Reclamation Service.

W. A. MOSER, Mayor.
J. A. DONOVAN,
Chairman Board of Supervisors.
E. S. KIRKPATRICK,
President Commercial Club.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate, before the matter is submitted for its decision, that 20 years ago or more a levee was built for the protection of Yuma against the rising waters of the Gila River, on the banks of which stream the city is located. There is a vast irrigation project there known as the Yuma project.

An unprecedented fall of snow, followed by warm rains from the mighty watershed of the Gila, the Salt, the Colorado, and their tributaries, has brought down an enormous flood, which has broken this dike, and the city to-day is under 5 feet of water.

I know, under the rule, the joint resolution ought to go to a committee. I am informed, as my colleague is informed, by various telegrams of these facts; and inasmuch as the Government is taking three-fourths of the valuable lands of the State for its own purposes, and now proposes to rent the balance for its own use, I think it is nothing but proper to these people that we should forego the question of a mere reference of the joint resolution to a committee. The impossibility of quick action under the circumstances arises in the outset from the difficulty of getting the committee together, and while we are going through with this program the people there will be drowned out. That can be prevented by providing for a sufficient number of men to do the work. The people are ruined by the flood and have not the money to do it for themselves. I hope there will be no objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the present consideration of the joint resolution, but I want to know from the Senator if any of this money is to be used for the amelioration of the condition of the people whose property has been destroyed? Are those people suffering for the necessities of life now?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no doubt about their suffering.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator further, can this work be done immediately—before the flood goes down—and if not, are such floods very frequent there?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The floods are not frequent. The levee has prevented flooding of the city on ordinary risings of the river; but this is an extraordinary occasion. The whole of the northern part of the State of Arizona is under water at this time, the flood being occasioned by the melting of snows, of which I have spoken. If we can get this assistance, we can now stop the flood from overflowing further the levee. We can get the men if we can get money enough there to stop it, and thus save the people from absolute destruction and from want for the necessities of life, which must follow the destruction of their homes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona will understand that I am not opposing the consideration or the passage of the joint resolution; but I thought, as it proposed to provide for the construction of a levee, that it would hardly be necessary to take such expeditious action. If, however, the Senator assures me that it is for the protection of those people, I shall have no objection to the prompt consideration of the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The joint resolution itself explains that it is for the protection of the people. When all property of the victims of this unfortunate condition shall have been swept away—as it will if this relief is delayed—then they must become, many of them, the objects of our solicitude and perhaps of charity.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if he will further assure us that there is no "pork" in this proposition? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If there were, I should not object to the passage of the resolution when I consider how Arizona has been treated by the Federal Government, and the condition of those for whom I plead. The Senator who asks assurance that there is no "pork" in the proposition does so in good nature, and probably to call attention to the injustice done certain bills in which he and his constituents are interested almost as deeply as I feel on the pending resolution. I accept his pleasantry in the spirit which animates his inquiry. But this is no matter to call forth even pleasant inquiry, for I see, and hope every Senator here will see, the tragedy hanging over my friends and constituents in this hour of their distress.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am especially interested in this very matter, but I do not believe that it is right to have a joint

resolution offered in the Senate and considered immediately, without being referred to a committee, when, under the rules, it should be so referred. The committee can act within four or five hours if the emergency is such as to justify it.

Mr. President, rather than to have the rules violated, notwithstanding I am interested in the passage of the resolution, I shall object to its immediate consideration, or until it has been considered by a committee of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to ask the Senator, if the Senate will bear with me a moment, how are we going to get the committee together to-day? Those people in Arizona are being drowned out of their homes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator can get the committee together.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not think so, for I have tried it often enough, and have found it impossible to get any committee together under such circumstances.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe the Senator can get the committee together if the emergency is such as he has here described it.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we ought to begin this proposed system of legislating. We have committees for the consideration of legislation; under the rules this joint resolution should go to a committee, and for that reason I ask that it be referred.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If it were a question of saving a man from hanging, then I suppose the question should go to a committee while the execution was going on.

Mr. GALLINGER. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, while this discussion is out of order, if I may have unanimous consent for a few minutes, I should like to submit some brief observations in connection with the request preferred by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

If this matter is to be acted on at all without conformity to established procedure, it must be done quickly and by an entire suspension of the rules and regulations which govern the expenditure of public money for the purposes indicated in the joint resolution. A system has grown up that, I think, is entirely too restrictive of the rights of Congress, but it is recognized as a system, and its rules and limitations are applied in all cases that come up where a state of facts similar to those recited in the preamble of the joint resolution exists.

The conditions at Yuma can be duplicated 50 times over in different sections of the country. I recall a situation down on the Red River, in Arkansas, in Texas, and in Louisiana, where similar conditions have occurred not only once but half a dozen times in the last two years; but fettered, as we have been, by the regulations imposed by Congress itself we have been unable to get any relief, or the hope of it. If this particular case in Arizona appeals more strongly than cases elsewhere, I am perfectly willing to make an exception by keeping my mouth shut here; but if the joint resolution goes to the Committee on Commerce it will take the usual course, which is to send it to the War Department for a report from the Engineers, and much will depend upon the character of the report that is made.

It is not a fact that Congress has up to this time committed itself to building levees for the mere purpose of protecting cities against inundation or the ravages of overflow.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will permit me, I can make that clearer to him by referring him to what Congress has already done.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will be through in a few seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. This levee was built by Congress itself not for the purpose simply of protecting the city, but for the purpose of protecting the Government's own land.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Irrigation projects are built out of a special fund consisting of the proceeds—

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, this has nothing to do with irrigation.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I thought the Senator stated that it would likely affect irrigation works.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is likely that the waters will flow across into irrigation works.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I probably relied more upon the recitals of the preamble than I did upon the statement of the Senator. I certainly do not want to put the Senator in the attitude of making statements that I question, because I do not.

If the matter is of that supreme urgency that appeals strongly to the sense of liberality on the part of Congress, then it ought to be whipped through without any word about it; but if it is to take the regular course, I notify the Senate now that that

course has been subjected to many limitations that at times have proved inconvenient. I think they are too restrictive, and I think sooner or later the whole subject will have to be presented to Congress for relaxation of the restrictions that are now imposed upon the Committee on Commerce and upon the Congress of the United States. In attempting to escape the complaints represented by the universal outcry against the "pork" proposition in connection with the river and harbor bill we have created another institution that is no better than the pork system; and as between the two systems I think the pork system a better one than the one we have got now, because it is subjected to all sorts of favoritism and we have been confronted habitually with reports in favor of some propositions and unfavorable reports in connection with better ones; but as long as it is a system recognized by Congress and finding its authority in a solemn statute passed by Congress and approved by the President, I think we must pay some attention to it.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is entirely right. The showing made in the telegram which has been read is not different from showings that can be made elsewhere, and does not approach in any possible degree the ravages from the sudden overflows that recently took place on the Ohio River and sections of the country there.

I could detain the Senate longer if I felt disposed to bring to its notice all the instances where damage has been inflicted upon the people and upon their property by sudden visitations in the form of overflows. If the Senator from Utah persists in his objection—and it is a very proper one, though, probably, I would not make it; but, being made, I have no hesitancy in saying it is a very proper one; and when it is made the proposition will have to undergo the routine established by Congress in such cases.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, that statement of the Senator from Arkansas shows the Senator from Utah just what I apprehended when I asked for unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution. If the joint resolution goes to the committee—and there is involved three or four days waiting for a report from the War Department and reports from the committees of Congress—it will be too late to do anything about it, so far as the people in the neighborhood of Yuma, Ariz., are concerned, for that river is still rising, according to the last reports I have had.

This case does not in any way stand on all fours with any other problem in the United States. Arizona is a State that had been held as a Territory for many years, and almost every resource of that State has been taken by the Federal Government, and the action sought to be taken will be along the line of protecting Federal property almost to as great an extent as it will be toward protecting individuals and the town of Yuma.

As I have said, the Federal Government has taken our lands and Arizona has only very limited resources. We can tax only our towns, our herds, and our mines; the Government has the balance of the valuable land, and is now going to take the rest of it; is going to impound our own waters and use them as it pleases, according to the terms of a bill now before this Congress. In that aspect of the case, with an emergency facing us, with distress and ruin confronting the people of the city, the Government itself, having built the original levee to protect its own property, as well as that of the city, and that levee having broken, with the consequence that there is an unprecedented flood there, I am going to say, with this condition facing me, that unless we can get relief this morning, probably it will come a long while too late.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, while I am in full sympathy with all the Senator from Arizona has stated, it does not change the condition one particle so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will wait a moment; I will not take more than a minute.

Another consideration, Mr. President, is that if this joint resolution goes to the House of Representatives the same information will be asked for by the House before it will pass upon it. Therefore, it will not hasten the passage of the resolution one hour to have it considered now without reference to the committee, and consequently I think that it just as well for the information to be secured by the Senate committee as to have it secured by the House committee, because it will have to be secured at last before the resolution can pass the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go to the Committee on Commerce, then.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Do I understand that the Senator from Utah has objected?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I feel compelled to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I deplore, but can not prevent, the Senator's action. I will try to get early action by the committee.

THE FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution offered by me yesterday, which went over, be now laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 76) submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 24th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate all facts bearing on the present condition of the frigate *Constitution*, now lying in the Charles River, Boston, and also an estimate of the amount of money that will be required to put the frigate in a condition of good repair, with a view of retaining the vessel as a historic relic of the early days of the American Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice given yesterday, I ask that Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution 60, which was under consideration yesterday, be now taken up.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this joint resolution provides for the investigation by a joint committee, made up of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, to determine what further legislation, if any, should be passed by Congress relating to interstate and foreign commerce. The joint resolution also defines the power of that committee.

Mr. President, if I were satisfied that this joint resolution, if passed, would not be used as a buffer to prevent any legislation along the lines of the proposed investigation, I would have no objection to it, and I would not put anything in the way of the proposed joint committee in getting any information that it might be able to secure by means of such investigation; but, in my judgment, if we pass this joint resolution, we will be continually met with an objection to the passage of any further legislation regarding interstate railroads and the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the statement will be made that such legislation should not be taken up until this investigation has been completed.

It is the opinion, I understand, of those who are behind the joint resolution—and I am satisfied that they are right in that respect—that this investigation will take a great deal of time; that it will run beyond this session of Congress at least. I judge from the remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] that it is deemed wise by those who father the joint resolution that legislation affecting railroads engaged in interstate commerce should not be undertaken now because a presidential campaign is coming on, and we can not legislate in as sober-minded a condition as though such a campaign were not coming on.

Mr. President, that objection can be urged against practically all legislation of a general character that can possibly be proposed. That objection, if good, can be urged against the Philippine bill that we now have as the unfinished business before the Senate. That objection can be urged against the rural-credit legislation that we are expected to take up soon. That objection can be raised against the bill now on the calendar, reported from the Committee on Commerce, regarding the building of dams for the purpose of developing electric power on navigable streams; and the same objection can be urged against the bill that was reported this morning from the Committee on Public Lands providing for the building of dams upon streams upon public lands.

So that it seems to me, if the objection of the Senator from Nevada is good, that, on account of a political contest that is coming on next summer and next fall, we should not pass this legislation, then we might just as well adjourn now and go home. The objection will apply to a great many of the appropriations that will be contained in the various appropriation bills that will be before the Senate.

I would be glad indeed, Mr. President, if we could consider this legislation, as well as all other legislation, free and absolutely divorced from any question of politics. According to my idea, we ought to consider all legislation free from partisan influence; but if partisan influence is going to interfere with this legislation, I see no reason why it will not to the same extent interfere with all legislation, at least all legislation of a general character. If I had my way, there would be no partisanship in this Chamber in the consideration of any legislation of any character.

Soon after the present administration went into office a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives the effect of which was to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the issuing of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads. This bill was introduced partly, I presume, if not entirely, on account of a pledge made in the Democratic platform that the Democratic Party would enact such legislation if given the power. With that part of the Democratic platform I was then and am now in entire accord.

This bill passed the House of Representatives after a great deal of consideration there. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. They had extended hearings on the bill and reported it to the Senate. It was on the calendar of the Senate during the first session of Congress after the incoming of the present administration. It remained there until that session adjourned. It remained there during the entire short session, and no effort whatever was made to pass the bill.

I have always regretted, and have so expressed myself to a great many of my Democratic friends in this body, that some action was not taken upon this bill; but it seems that all at once a change came over the majority, and they decided that the bill should not become a law. There is no doubt but what the strong hand which stopped the progress of this legislation was extended across its path from the White House. While the Senator from Nevada regrets that if legislation of this kind should be taken up now politics might enter into it, I fear that if not the object, at least the real thing that is intended to be accomplished by this resolution is partisan. I fear that it is going to be used by the Democratic Party in the coming campaign as an excuse for not legislating not only upon that subject but upon others. It seems to me, therefore, that there is more politics in passing it than there is in defeating it.

The Democratic platform adopted at the Baltimore convention contained this provision:

We favor such legislation as will effectually prohibit the railroads, express, telegraph, and telephone companies from engaging in business which brings them into competition with their shippers or patrons; also legislation preventing the overissue of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads.

I presume the President of the United States was trying to avoid the consequences of that particular provision of the platform when, on December 7, 1915, in his official message to Congress he used this language:

In the meantime may I make this suggestion? The transportation problem is an exceedingly serious and pressing one in this country. There has from time to time of late been reason to fear that our railroads would not much longer be able to cope with it successfully as at present equipped and coordinated. I suggest that it would be wise to provide for a commission of inquiry to ascertain by a thorough canvass of the whole question whether our laws as at present framed and administered are as serviceable as they might be in the solution of the problem.

Further on he says:

It seems to me that it might be the part of wisdom, therefore, before further legislation in this field is attempted, to look at the whole problem of coordination and efficiency in the full light of a fresh assessment of circumstance and opinion as a guide to dealing with the several parts of it.

I presume, Mr. President, that this resolution has been introduced by the Senator from Nevada with a view to carrying out that recommendation of the President. In other words, the President advised that before any further legislation be had an investigation should be had; and now we are brought face to face with the proposition that in carrying out that suggestion we shall enter upon an investigation that will perhaps take up two or three years. At least, it will go beyond the campaign now before us.

But, Mr. President, in connection with the President's advice that we should not further legislate on these matters, I want to read from another message that he delivered soon after he became President, while perhaps the pledge in the Democratic platform was fresher in his mind. That was on January 20, 1914. The one I have read from was delivered December 7, 1915, nearly two years after this from which I shall now read.

In that official message the President used the following language:

In the second place, business men as well as those who direct public affairs now recognize, and recognize with painful clearness, the great harm and injustice which has been done to many, if not all, of the great railroad systems of the country by the way in which they have been financed and their own distinctive interests subordinated to the interests of the men who financed them and of other business enterprises which those men wished to promote. The country is ready, therefore, to accept, and accept with relief as well as approval, a law which will confer upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to superintend and regulate the financial operations by which the railroads are henceforth to be supplied with the money they need for their proper development to meet the rapidly growing requirements of the country for increased and improved facilities of transportation.

Between the delivery to Congress of this message in which the President advocates this legislation, and the other message, delivered over a year later, in which he asks us not to legislate but to investigate, what has taken place? Instead of this committee being appointed to investigate as provided in this resolution, we ought to have the committee investigate to see why the President changed his mind. We ought to have the committee investigate to give information to the country as to why, following soon after his election to that great office, he advocated in good faith carrying out that provision of the platform upon which he was elected, and then, in the face of the next campaign in which he wants to be reelected, he comes again officially before Congress and asks us to stay our hands. There is fruitful ground for investigation if this committee wants to undertake it.

Mr. President, I propose to show that the President knew what he said and was right in the message that he delivered in December, 1914, and that he had absolutely closed his eyes in the face of abundant evidence, for some reason known to himself alone, when he delivered the other. If you will search through his messages, you will find at no place any reason that he has given why he wanted to confer that authority upon the Interstate Commerce Commission in December, 1914, and why he wanted to withhold it in June, 1915.

Mr. President, for many years the Interstate Commerce Commission has been asking Congress for authority to superintend the issuing of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads. There is an abundance of evidence officially in the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission to convince any man, I think, that there is some legislation, as the President said in his message, that ought to be enacted. He said, in December, 1914—

Business men * * * recognize, and recognize with painful clearness, the great harm and injustice which has been done to many, if not all, of the great railroad systems by the way in which they have been financed and their own distinctive interests subordinated to the interests of the men who financed them.

I am going to show, I think, that that was and is the case. I want to say, to begin with, that I would not go as far as the President did in his condemnation of the financial conditions of the railroads. It may be that he had more information than I have. If he did, there is all the more reason why there should be an investigation made as to why he has taken it all back. I would not charge, as he intimates—he does not charge it directly, but he intimates—that this has been true of many, if not all, of the great railroad systems.

Mr. President, as far as I know, there are many of the great railroad systems of the country that are operated upon an honest, fair business basis; and it is only because I should like to see remedied the condition that has applied in the past to some of the railroads, by which financial pirates have ruined some of the greatest railroad systems of the world, that I am taking the floor now and calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that no investigation is necessary. Investigations have been made, and I am going to produce to-day some of the evidence that those investigations have brought forth.

Every railroad, being a quasi-public institution, ought to be managed with absolute honesty. Many of the difficulties with which honest railroads as well as others have been confronted have come about because of the rotten financial management and control that has resulted in the ruin of some great systems of railroads and in taking away from thousands and thousands of honest stockholders the earnings of a lifetime.

Every railroad stock and every railroad bond ought to be as substantial and as good as a Government bond. If we had honest management of the finances of the railroads of our country, that would be the case. Then any man with savings, any trustee with trust funds, would be able to invest in the stocks or bonds of railroads knowing that the investment was going to be honestly dealt with, honestly handled, and that there would be no danger of some financial manipulation going on

behind the scenes by which he might be absolutely ruined. As it has been, it has been more or less a gambling operation to invest in stocks or bonds of interstate railroads.

That is the condition I want to remedy, and I am appearing now as a friend to honest railroads. I should like to have a law passed that would put behind the bars men who steal millions, the same as you put behind the bars men who steal pennies.

Mr. President, the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitted a report January 26, 1914, showing the result of their investigation of several railroads known as the Frisco System. I am only going to quote brief extracts from these various reports, because if I made no attempt to brief it would take days to produce all the evidence that is at hand. They say:

The difficulties of the Frisco were of a financial and not of an operating character.

There is the difficulty. That has been the cause of the downfall of railroads. That is the reason why honest railroads often have a difficult time to get money. It is because honest people are afraid to invest their money in the stocks and bonds.

In this Frisco case the Interstate Commerce Commission go on to show how the men who were controlling the finances of the railroads ruined it; how they organized syndicates composed of financial men outside and the officers of the railroad itself inside, and through these syndicates bought and invested in various things—branch railroads, stocks, and bonds. After summarizing various of these investments they sum up one part of their report as follows:

The profits realized by syndicates and trust companies on the sale of the Frisco were as follows.

Then they itemize the different corporations in which they had improperly and wrongfully invested the money which belonged to the stockholders, making a total loss in that one item alone of \$8,444,706.51.

They go into details with some of the companies. Here is one of them, and I am going to read only their conclusion. After they had examined the evidence and made an investigation of one company they say:

Organizing the new company and disposing of the securities through this syndicate was not a labor of love on the part of those who composed the syndicate. The commissions received by them amounted to \$494,894.44, and their profits on subscriptions were \$1,783,207.15.

This syndicate, composed of officers of the company mainly who were occupying positions of trust, who if they had been honest ought to have represented the stockholders, who were all drawing salaries for their positions, and some of them large salaries—this syndicate went into some land business. The commission gave it in detail here, and they say:

The land deals, the cash bonuses, and the syndicate's exploitations resulted in a profit to the syndicate of \$892,487.21.

And they wind up:

The effect of the entire transaction was that the syndicate secured a profit of \$3,011,929.75, which included the profits on land, the cash donations, and the syndicate's operations.

Mr. President, it would be interesting, if I wanted to take the time to go through this report and show in detail how each one of these things was operated. It is sufficient to say that in every instance it was done by men who were occupying positions of trust and who were drawing salaries from the stockholders whom they were robbing.

If the Senator from Nevada hired me and paid me a salary for the purpose, let us say, of buying horses, and I went out and bought a team for \$400 and then turned it over to him at \$800 I would be called a robber and a thief. I would be arrested and sent to jail. But if other officers, with myself, who were officers of an interstate railroad, holding in trust the finances of thousands and thousands of honest people, knew of some property that that railroad perhaps ought to have and could buy it for a million dollars, and if then, with my other associates also drawing a salary, we would buy it for a million dollars and turn it over to our employer for \$2,000,000, I would be doing just exactly what time and time again has been done by the financial pirates who have made fortunes for themselves by practically stealing it, not from an ordinary person but from some persons for whom they were occupying positions of honor and trust and were paid immense salaries.

Mr. President, the committee does not need to investigate. They can have access to this evidence. They can get it. The President probably knew something about it when he delivered that first message, when fresh from his victory he was anxious to carry out the pledge he made to the people and asked us to enact a law. He knew it then. He has forgotten it now.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to interrupt the continuity of the Senator's argument, but sometime before he takes his seat I suggest this question: Does not the proposition as presented by the appointment of this committee raise a different question, and that is the question whether or not regulation and control is not of itself breaking down, whether or not that is the proper system and method to deal with the transportation question? In other words, does not the President—perhaps I should not refer to the President, because I do not know just what his views are on this question, but do not those who seek now, after 20 years of experience in reference to regulation and control, to reenter upon the question of investigation admit by that proposition that they are really investigating the question whether regulation and control is the proper method by which to deal with the railroad question?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I might just as well answer that now as at any time. As I said at the beginning, I would have no objection to this investigation being made if I was sure that it was not going to be used as an argument against any legislation of this kind in the future. The investigation along the lines suggested by the Senator from Idaho would be valuable. It would be a good thing to engage on, but while we are investigating these same things which I have already pointed out, and more that I am going to point out may be going on all over the country, do we want to practically say by our silence that while we believe in punishing the man who robs his neighbor or who steals his purse we are in favor of remaining quiet while men rob millions that have been contributed in pennies, often by widows and orphans? Not only that, but it has the effect of ruining or at least injuring all honestly managed railroads in the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I was led to submit that question to the Senator by reason of the fact that there is much argument being adduced in these days to the effect that the regulation and control of transportation through commissions is a failure. I want to read, with the permission of the Senator, an authority upon this question, so that it may receive his attention before he closes:

Governmental control, which we are undertaking so extensively and with so light a heart, sets up not a reign of law, but a reign of discretion and individual judgment on the part of governmental officials in the regulation of the business of stock companies owned by innumerable private individuals and supplying the chief investments of thousands of communities. I can see no radical difference in principle between governmental ownership and governmental regulation of this discretionary kind. Regulation by commission is not regulation by law, but control according to the discretion of governmental officials. Regulation by law is judicial, by fixed and definite rule, whereas regulation by commission is an affair of business sense, of the comprehension and thorough understanding of complex and various bodies of business. There is no logical stopping place between that and the actual conduct of business enterprises by the Government.

Such methods of regulation, it may be safely predicted, will sooner or later be completely discredited by experience. Commissions in the future as in the past will reflect rather public opinion than business discretion. The only safe process, the only American process, the only effective process is the regulation of transactions by the definite prohibitions of law, item by item, as experience discloses their character and their effects, and the punishment of the particular individuals who engage in them.

Mr. President, there is a statement of a defect in the subject of regulation or control by commissions at all, which I apprehend is one of the things into which this committee is going to inquire. In my judgment we must assume there is a deeper problem than that which appears upon the face of this movement.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from Idaho did not quote his authority. He said it was distinguished authority. I should like to have it quoted.

Mr. BORAH. I have been criticized here so much for being familiar with the President's writings, I thought I might permit it to stand upon its own merit. That is a statement from the President made some several years ago.

Mr. NORRIS. I think we all understood it was from the President.

Mr. BORAH. But I presented it here for the reason that it seems this committee has no occasion to go into the investigation of facts as to what law we should have if we are going to continue to regulate and control public corporations through commissions. We have sufficient facts, as the Senator is demonstrating, beyond question, to legislate now.

Mr. NORRIS. That is my idea.

Mr. BORAH. It must be, Mr. President, that this committee proposes to go into the deeper and profounder question whether or not regulation and control is the proper method to deal with transportation.

Mr. NORRIS. I would be glad to have them investigate that; I would be glad to get any information we can; but as to whether we ought to have some legislation now, I do not believe there can be any doubt.

The Interstate Commerce Commission investigated the New Haven road. They have two reports on the New Haven road and they are both exceedingly interesting.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was not giving the Senator my attention during the first part of his speech, and I wanted to inquire of him whether at any stage of his speech he has indicated what additional legislation he thinks we ought to have?

Mr. NORRIS. I have not, but I am going to do so before I get through.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator had not so indicated at some other point in his speech I was going to ask him, before he finishes his remarks, if he would do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I intend to do that before I get through, and if I should forget to do it, I would be glad to have the Senator from North Carolina or some one else call my attention to the fact that I have forgotten it.

When I was interrupted I was about to make some comments and read some facts from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the New Haven road, and again the trouble is all financial. In other words, like the commission said in regard to the Frisco system, the trouble is with its financial operation. It is because the men who control the finances of the railroads have not been fair but in many cases have been downright dishonest that we have many of the receivers and much of the congestion and much of the difficulty that now stares the country in the face in the interstate transportation problem. The Interstate Commerce Commission say:

June 30, 1903, the total capitalization of the New Haven Co. was approximately \$93,000,000, of which \$79,000,000 was stock and \$14,000,000 bonds. The mileage then operated was 2,040 miles. On June 30, 1912, the capitalization, excluding stock premiums, was \$417,000,000, an increase of \$324,000,000, while the operated mileage was 2,090, an increase of 50 miles.

So they go on somewhat in detail and analyze their statement and wind up with this language:

This would leave the sum of \$204,000,000 which in nine years had been expended in operations outside its railroad sphere. This fact of itself is a most significant one, which, standing alone, might well require explanation. Attention is here directed to some of the purposes for which and the manner in which this vast sum has been invested.

Then they start out and show the various investments that were made. They organized, like the men in managing the Frisco did, various subsidiary corporations, bought and sold subsidiary railroad stocks and bonds, steamship lines, navigation companies, steamboats, and other things. In speaking of the New York, Westchester & Boston Railway as one of the subsidiary companies where they spent a lot of this money, the commission said:

Here, therefore, is an enterprise which has cost the New Haven Co. \$12,000,000 in excess of the value of its property upon its own showing. Again the question arises, What has become of this \$12,000,000? In case of the Rhode Island Co. it was possible to locate the corporation, if not the individual, which had ostensibly obtained the money, but in this case it is impossible from anything upon the books of the New Haven Co. to do this even approximately. So far as those records go this money has vanished into thin air.

The New Haven Co., or those who controlled its finances, had a great deal to do with the company organized by Mr. Billard, and after going over that at some length they say:

It may be that the true inwardness of this transaction is not yet understood; but the accounting officers of the New Haven Co. have been heard in testimony, the president of that company has been heard in explanation, and upon this record as it stands the New Haven Co. has given away of the funds of that company to Mr. Billard and his associates or to the stockholders of the Billard Co., whatever that may be, between \$2,500,000 and \$3,000,000 of the property of the New Haven Co.

In another place the commission say:

The purpose, or at least the effect, of this New Haven bookkeeping is to utterly becloud those operations so as to render any intelligent understanding of them almost impossible. If the thing done is legitimate, why not do it in a direct way? If the purpose be honest, why clothe it in the habiliments of the mountebank? The mere fact that such methods are employed inspires distrust. No man can examine the history of the New Haven Co. for the last nine years without a feeling of doubt and uncertainty. The use of such methods in the management of public utilities should not be tolerated.

In a further investigation, Mr. President, made by the commission of this same railroad, printed July 15, 1914, the commission further commented upon the financial operation of this great

system of railways, one of the greatest systems in the world. They use this language:

The New Haven system has more than 300 subsidiary corporations, in a web of entangling alliances with each other, many of which were seemingly planned, created, and manipulated by lawyers expressly retained for the purpose of concealment or deception. Ordinarily in investigations of this character evidence is easily adduced by placing the witnesses upon the stand, but in this investigation the witnesses other than the accountants for the commission were in the main hostile, and with few exceptions their testimony was unwillingly given.

The result of our research into the financial workings of the former management of the New Haven system has been to disclose one of the most glaring instances of maladministration revealed in all the history of American railroading.

You do not need to have any committee make an investigation in order to ascertain those facts. A commission, better equipped to investigate than any committee either of the Senate or of the House, have given you not only their conclusions, but all of the facts; they have presented all of the evidence, and it is accessible to every Member of Congress. The commission further say:

The difficulties under which this railroad system has labored in the past are internal and wholly due to its own mismanagement. Its troubles have not arisen because of regulation by governmental authority. Its greatest losses and most costly blunders were made in attempting to circumvent governmental regulation and to extend its domination beyond the limits fixed by law.

The subject matter of this inquiry relates to the financial operation of a railroad system which, on June 30, 1903, had a total capitalization of approximately \$93,000,000, of which \$79,000,000 was stock and \$14,000,000 bonds. In the 10 years from June 30, 1903, this capitalization was increased from \$93,000,000 to \$417,000,000, exclusive of stock premiums, or an increase of \$324,000,000. Of this increase approximately \$120,000,000 was devoted to its railroad property and was expended for betterments and equipment. This leaves the sum of \$204,000,000, which was expended for operations outside of its railroad sphere. Through the expenditure of this sum this railroad system has practically monopolized the freight and passenger business in five of the States of the Union. It has acquired a monopoly of competing steamship lines and trolley systems in the section which it serves. The financial operations necessary for those acquisitions and the losses which they have entailed have been skillfully concealed by the juggling of money and securities from one subsidiary corporation to another.

They further say:

SIGNIFICANT INCIDENTS.

Marked features and significant incidents in the loose, extravagant, and improvident administration of the finances of the New Haven as shown in this investigation are the Boston & Maine despoliment; the iniquity of the Westchester acquisition; the double price paid for the Rhode Island trolleys; the recklessness in the purchase of Connecticut and Massachusetts trolleys at prices exorbitantly in excess of their market value; the unwarranted expenditure of large amounts in "educating public opinion"; the disposition, without knowledge of the directors, of hundreds of thousands of dollars for influencing public sentiment; the habitual payment of unitemized vouchers without any clear specification of details; the confusing inter-relation of the principal company and its subsidiaries and consequent complication of accounts; the practice of financial legerdemain in issuing large blocks of New Haven stock for notes of the New England Navigation Co., and manipulating these securities back and forth; fictitious sales of New Haven stock to friendly parties with the design of boosting the stock and unloading on the public at the higher "market price"; the unlawful diversion of corporate funds to political organizations; the scattering of retainers to attorneys of five States, who rendered no itemized bills for services and who conducted no litigation to which the railroad was a party; extensive use of a paid lobby in matters as to which the directors claim to have no information; the attempt to control utterances of the press by subsidizing reporters; payment of money and the profligate issue of free passes to legislators and their friends; the investment of \$400,000 in securities of a New England newspaper; the regular employment of political bosses in Rhode Island and other States, not for the purpose of having them perform any service but to prevent them, as Mr. Mellen expressed it, from "becoming active on the other side"; the retention by John L. Billard of more than \$2,700,000 in a transaction in which he represented the New Haven and into which he invested not a dollar; the inability of Oakleigh Thorne to account for \$1,032,000 of the funds of the New Haven entrusted to him in carrying out the Westchester proposition; the story of Mr. Mellen as to the distribution of \$1,200,000 for corrupt purposes in bringing about amendments of the Westchester and Port Chester franchises; the domination of all the affairs of this railroad by Mr. Morgan and Mr. Mellen and the absolute subordination of other members of the board of directors to the will of these two; the unwarranted increase of the New Haven liabilities from \$93,000,000 in 1903 to \$417,000,000 in 1913; the increase in floating notes from nothing in 1903 to approximately \$40,000,000 in 1913; the indefensible standard of business ethics and the absence of financial acumen displayed by eminent financiers in directing the destinies of this railroad in its attempt to establish a monopoly of the transportation of New England. A combination of all these has resulted in the present deplorable situation in which the affairs of this railroad are involved.

THE NEW YORK, WESTCHESTER & BOSTON RAILWAY CO.

They say that is one of the subsidiary companies—

The Westchester is a story of the profligate waste of corporate funds. The road was not necessary as a part of the New Haven system. It parallels other lines already owned by the New Haven and traverses territory which the New Haven already served. That it was recognized as unnecessary by the New Haven itself at its inception is evidenced by the fact that the New Haven sought an injunction to restrain the construction of this road on the specific ground that it was not in answer to any public necessity and paralleled its already existing line.

The enormous sum of \$36,434,173.25 was expended for a road only 18.03 miles in extent, which is being operated at an annual loss of

approximately \$1,250,000, and which will have to increase its earnings four and one-half fold before it can pay its operating expenses and fixed charges. It is inconceivable that this enterprise could have been entered into by the New Haven as a result of the mandates of good judgment and proper railroading.

I have been reading mostly the summarizing by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the various enterprises. I want to read some of the details of one of them. As an incident in one of these transactions, where they had spent millions of dollars in getting this short railroad—and it was necessary, I judge, by reading between the lines, to control a lot of politicians—they expended over a million dollars in this operation. The commission said:

In explaining how these negotiations were conducted, Mr. Mellen testified that it was intended that one share of New Haven stock should be exchanged for three shares of Westchester stock.

Just before this he testified that Westchester stock was worth about 10 cents a pound; it was practically worthless; and they were giving one share of New Haven for three shares of worthless stock.

When the New Haven stock was not immediately at hand he issued to the messenger who brought Westchester stock a duebill, which was in terms an order on himself to pay on demand to bearer the specified number of shares of New Haven stock or its equivalent in cash at \$150 per share, with accrued dividends. Many of these duebills were not presented until Mr. Mellen's connection with the New Haven was severed, and five of them, aggregating \$50,000, approximately, are still outstanding. During the time the duebills were outstanding Mr. Mellen collected the dividends on the New Haven stock which they represented, and at each dividend period unknown messengers would appear in his office at the Grand Central Station, in New York City, and demand these dividends, which Mr. Mellen would then pay with his personal checks, so drawn that the identity of the persons cashing them could not be ascertained.

And thus they spent in this way to unknown persons more than a million dollars.

Witnesses who were officers of some of these companies appeared before the commission and testified that they acted as "dummies" under the directions of Robbins and of attorneys selected by him.

And, by the way, Robbins was an attorney of the New Haven road, getting a salary from that corporation.

Some of them handled, without any knowledge of the nature or purpose of the transactions, checks approximating \$3,000,000.

In speaking of the Billard Co., the commission says:

All the assets of the Billard Co. belong to the stockholders of the New Haven Railroad. All the money sunk in its operations belonged to the New Haven Railroad.

A suit should be maintainable by the New Haven against Billard and all who have participated in this fraud upon the stockholders.

I read that opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission right there for the purpose of emphasizing the need of legislation that will permit an action by the ruined corporation, and, if not by the corporation, then by the stockholders, against the persons who have committed the wrong to recover the damages they have sustained.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know of any existing law under which that can be done?

Mr. NORRIS. I presume there is such a law. I presume under the laws of the States, probably, that kind of an action could be maintained; but the practical difficulty of applying it renders it almost an impossibility, as has been demonstrated in the New Haven case. There were some suits instituted there, but nothing has ever been recovered.

Mr. KENYON. I introduced, some years ago, a bill along that line, which was pretty carefully drawn by those who thought they knew the subject; but it rests in the usual mausoleum for bills of that character.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator does not think, therefore, does he, that we ought to spend two or three more years investigating to see whether we ought to have that kind of a law?

Mr. KENYON. I think we have enough evidence on that subject now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa—

Mr. NORRIS. I would prefer that the Senator would direct his question to me. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then I will ask the Senator from Nebraska to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he pressed the bill to which he referred before the Interstate Commerce Committee. I have no recollection of the consideration of that bill being urged.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the Senator from Nevada has asked that question, I will let the Senator from Iowa answer it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I always give very great consideration to any urgency upon his part for the consideration of any measure.

Mr. KENYON. I want to answer that in this way: I introduced, I think three or four years ago, a bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to make uniform classifications in freight rates. That bill passed the Senate and went to the House. The railroads then became very active and hearings were had in the House, but the bill did not pass the House and Congress adjourned. I introduced the bill again at the next session of the Senate, and it went to a subcommittee, by whom hearings were held, lasting nearly all summer, but I have never heard what became of the bill. My experience with it was so absolutely discouraging that I have not pressed it as perhaps I should have done, but in view of the argument now being made I shall try to do so. In the meantime I would be glad if the Senator from Nebraska would ask the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee what has become of the bill giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to make uniform classifications?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that I will send over to the committee and ascertain what the status is at present. I can not recall the exact status of that bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall have more to say, Mr. President, a little later on, when I get through with these citations, about legislation of the nature of that in regard to which the Senator from Iowa has interrogated the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is able to furnish the information for which he asks.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I prefer not to be led off on another issue.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senator from Nebraska ought to be willing to have the Senate furnished with the information.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I will yield. Go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. To anybody; to the Senator from Arkansas first.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely desired to answer the inquiry made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] as to what action had been taken concerning the bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a uniform classification of freight rates.

During the last Congress the bill was referred to a subcommittee of which I was chairman, and prolonged hearings were had upon the bill. The subcommittee reached the conclusion that no legislation should be had at that time, for the reason that the classification is now being made by the carriers themselves. The work is progressing with a fair degree of rapidity, and to impose that additional work on the Interstate Commerce Commission, as now organized, would simply overwhelm them with burdens which they could not perform satisfactorily either to themselves or to the public.

So far as I know, no action has been taken concerning the measure since its reintroduction during the present Congress by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. May I inquire of the Senator from Arkansas if any report of that kind was filed with the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, sir. No report was made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in speaking of "dummy" corporations the Interstate Commerce Commission uses this language:

The frequency with which dummy corporations and dummy directors appear in this record leads to the conclusion that some one high in the councils of the New Haven had an obsession upon the subject of the utility of such sham methods. The directors of the Billard Co. confessed that they were dummies and knew nothing of its operations. Why men of respectability and standing as these appear to be should lend their names as dummies passes comprehension.

In the organization of one of the steamship companies the young lady stenographer was made president, and a youth of 21 years of age by the name of Grover Cleveland Richards—

I presume it was on account of his name—

was selected as treasurer of another company. Clerks and irresponsible persons were drawn upon to supply the demands for dummies in the financial joy riding by the management of the New Haven.

Thus, throughout the entire story of deception, the New Haven management vainly endeavored to hide the true facts behind these dummy individuals and dummy corporations.

While stock in the New Haven road was listed on the New York Stock Exchange a large portion of its funds were invested in "blue-sky" corporations, the officers of which knew nothing of the purposes or assets of the companies of which they were managers or officers.

The Senator from Illinois referred to one of the officers of the Frisco Road—and, by the way, he was also an officer of the Rock Island—going before a Republican club and making a speech. I want to read what the commission have to say about the politics of this railroad. They say:

The New Haven Railroad had no politics. It was Democratic in Democratic States and Republican in Republican States. As Mr. Mellen testified, its effort was always to "get under the best umbrella."

Then follow several contributions that were made for political purposes. Often in their examination they found that these contributions and expenditures were not traceable directly to political parties and political committees, but from various circumstances, and from the fact that no other explanation could be made, and circumstantial evidence bearing upon the particular transaction, they were of the opinion that they had been used for political purposes, or at least for purposes beyond what they ought to have been used for.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator regard the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission as trustworthy and sufficient?

Mr. NORRIS. I regard the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission as trustworthy. Unless there were some circumstances surrounding the case that would throw some suspicion on it, I consider that it would be just as trustworthy as a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator knows of no such circumstances?

Mr. NORRIS. Not in this case nor in any other case to which I will refer. There have been charges in the railroad rate case that improper influences were used and had some effect, but I am not referring in any way to that case.

In summing up the investments in one of these subsidiary companies the commission say:

From all of the foregoing and from a careful consideration of the method in which expenditures, not specified herein, have been made, it is submitted that a reasonable estimate of the loss to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. by reason of waste and mismanagement will amount to between \$60,000,000 and \$90,000,000.

The splendid property of the New Haven Railroad itself will be called upon for many a year to make up the drain upon its resources resulting from the unpardonable folly of the transactions outside the proper field in which stockholders supposed their moneys were invested. But honesty and efficiency of management of this property as a railroad only will, undoubtedly, in time, restore its former standing.

You will notice here that they say that their losses are between \$60,000,000 and \$90,000,000. In another place in the opinion they said that the amount of money belonging to the New Haven stockholders improperly used was \$204,000,000. Of course in this investment of \$204,000,000 outside of railroad business proper there was some saved, resulting, as they say here, only in a net loss of between sixty and ninety million dollars.

Now, I want to read the conclusion that was reached by the commission in this case:

This investigation has demonstrated that the monopoly theory of those controlling the New Haven was unsound and mischievous in its effects. To achieve such monopoly meant the reckless and scandalous expenditure of money; it meant the attempt to control public opinion; corruption of government; the attempt to pervert the political and economic instincts of the people in insolent defiance of law. Through exposure of the methods of this monopoly the invisible government which has gone far in its efforts to dominate New England has been made visible. It has been clearly proven how public opinion was distorted; how officials who were needed and who could be bought were bought; how newspapers that could be subsidized were subsidized; how a college professor and publicists secretly accepted money from the New Haven while masking as a representative of a great American university and as the guardians of the interests of the people; how agencies of information to the public were prostituted wherever they could be prostituted in order to carry out a scheme of private transportation monopoly imperial in its scope.

Most of the directors of the New Haven accepted their responsibilities lightly. They failed to realize that their names gave confidence to the public and that their connection with the corporation led the public to invest. When these directors were negligent and serious losses resulted therefrom they were guilty of a grave dereliction of duty and a breach of trust that was morally wrong and criminal in its fruits.

Here are some of the recommendations they made:

Directors should be made individually liable to civil and criminal laws for the manner in which they discharge their trust. A corporation can be no better or worse than those who operate it. It should be just as grave a crime to plunder stockholders or the public through a railroad corporation as it is to personally rob an individual.

They conclude by saying:

The insuring of honesty throughout the management of the great railroads of the country is a most important question before the people to-day, and only when through exposure of wrongdoing and an awakened public conscience coupled with effective laws this result is produced, may railroading be placed upon the high level that it should occupy. The revelations in this record make it essential for the wel-

fare of the Nation that the reckless and profligate financiering which has blighted this railroad system be ended, and until this is fully done there will be no assurance that the story of the New Haven will not be told again with the stockholders of some other railroad system as the victims.

I submit, Mr. President, that to put that recommendation into law requires no investigation of an extended nature by a joint committee of the House and the Senate.

I wish to conclude what I have to say by reading some extracts from another report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, made in the case of the Rock Island Railroad. In order that we may first get an idea as to just exactly what the Rock Island is, I will read a paragraph from the beginning of the opinion:

In 1902 the main line of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. extended from Chicago to Denver, with branch lines to St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Kansas City. The territory served is one of the richest and most prosperous in the country and the system's ramification of branch lines insures to it a large volume of tonnage. It was then thriving and its prospects were promising, its stock selling in the markets of the world at more than \$200 a share. In 1914 the shares had fallen to \$20 and the road is now in receivers' hands. The evidence shows that the earnings of the railway company have steadily increased, and that in 1914 they were the largest in its history.

And yet it went into the hands of a receiver.

It seems to me that that simple statement tells a story that we ought to heed, Mr. President. In 10 years the stock of this company fell from \$200 to \$20 a share, and then the company went into the hands of a receiver, as they show in here, altogether and entirely on account of financial mismanagement. The earnings increased every year, and last year, 1914, they were greater than they had ever been in the history of the company.

Much the same method was used here by the officers of the company that was used in the other cases to which I have referred. We find that these men who were getting salaries from this railroad company were continually organizing syndicates for the purpose of buying subsidiary corporations, dealing in various things, using the money of the railroad company to do it with, and always making a profit out of it themselves. I believe there is one instance, at least, where one man became the agent of the other corporation to sell it, so that he got a commission from the other corporation for making the sale and he got a commission from the Rock Island Co. for making the purchase, in addition to which he drew his own salary. Many of the salaries, in my judgment, were much larger than they ought to have been, even though the officers had been faithful to their trust.

The officers of this railroad company, in addition to practicing the methods pursued in others of buying from some other company and selling to the company which they represented, gave direct bonuses to themselves; and the Interstate Commerce Commission gives some illustration about it.

Following are specific instances shown of record of the contributions referred to:

J. E. Gorman, first vice president in charge of freight and passenger traffic, was secretly paid \$18,750 per annum, making his total compensation \$43,750, whereas the pay roll showed \$25,000.

C. A. Morse, chief engineer, received a salary of \$15,000 per annum and a secret bonus of \$3,000 on the first of each year.

Upon the retirement of R. A. Jackson as general solicitor, he was given \$100,000 in cash.

As an inducement to L. F. Loree, chairman of the executive committee, to relinquish, after 10 months' service, a joint contract with the railway company and the Frisco under which he was to receive a salary of \$75,000 per annum for a period of five years, and in addition was to be paid a bonus of \$500,000 at the expiration of the contract, he was given bonds of the railway company of a par value of \$450,000. This was borne equally by the two companies, and the proportion of the railway company was charged to profit and loss. The total amount borne by the railway company in this transaction exceeded \$250,000.

C. H. Warren, vice president, was given by the railway company \$150,000 in par value of the common and \$105,000 in par value of the preferred stock of the New Jersey company and \$50,000 in cash. There was no board authorization for the latter expenditure, the item being represented in the records of the railway company merely by a voucher signed by D. G. Reid.

The New Jersey corporation was a subsidiary of the railroad company.

R. R. Cable, a member of the executive committee, received from the railway company \$30,000 in bonds of the Iowa company—

That was another subsidiary company—

then worth \$24,500, for his services in the acquisition of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway Co., and he was paid by the latter company \$85,000 in the same transaction. Mr. Cable also received another contribution, which will be referred to later.

Robert Mather, vice president, was given \$25,000 in cash.

George T. Boggs, director and secretary of the board of directors of the railway company, was given \$15,000 in cash when he retired from the secretaryship of the railway company.

Then they appropriated several millions of stock of their own company. After they increased the capital stock of the Rock Island to \$10,000,000 at one time and several millions at another and used the proceeds for the purposes for which it was issued and had some stock left, they divided it among themselves. So

that these men who were occupying positions of trust for this company and drawing large salaries—I have a list of their salaries—were continually robbing the people whom they were expected to represent.

Speaking of some voucher payments, some irregular payments, they say:

Another voucher in favor of the Liberty National Bank of New York City, in exchange for a cashier's check issued to Robert Mather for \$25,000, is charged to "general expenses" under "operating expenses." This voucher refers to a miscellaneous file shown by the index thereto to have comprehended "contributions to campaign committee." The file, however, was not produced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, a small measure that I was interested in was reported this morning when I was out of the Chamber attending a committee meeting.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ascertain if the Senator wishes to take the bill up now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask my colleague [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] if they will not agree to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business, or if I shall be recognized by the Chair I can proceed with the matter which has been before the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say that I prefer the Senator shall proceed with his speech, because I promised the Senator from Utah that I would not ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if I can get recognition, I will proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will explain to the Senator from Nebraska that I was not here this morning because I was attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which is considering the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. At 2 o'clock the subcommittee meets again and I shall have to return.

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 76, which has been favorably reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it will then be necessary for me to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose stated by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not necessary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not necessary, as the Senator from Alabama after the regular order was called up obtained the floor and asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. It does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not consent to that course because it would displace the unfinished business. I ask that my request be put first.

Mr. SMOOT. No, it would not displace the unfinished business unless it led to discussion and we were discussing the joint resolution at the time we adjourned. Then it would displace the unfinished business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am aware of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the request of the Senator from Nebraska to the effect that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent for the specific disposition of the joint resolution in hand. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LOAN OF TENTS AND COTS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 1,000 tents and 1,000 cots for the use of the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Birmingham, Ala., in May, 1916.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to make a short statement as to the purpose of the joint resolution. It is in the usual

form. It has been customary in the past when these encampments were held, either by the Grand Army of the Republic or by Confederate veterans, to loan to them tents and cots. The joint resolution I have now called up is prepared in the same form as other measures that have been passed in years gone by. Accompanying it there is a letter from the Secretary of War stating that the property will be available, and the joint resolution provides that the persons getting the tents for this encampment shall give bond for their safe return to the Government without injury. It is necessary to pass it at this time, so that they may be advised as to whether they can have the use of tents for the purpose of the encampment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Wait just a minute, until I read the letter from the Secretary of War. [After a pause.] I do not object.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to give a notice that to-morrow, at the expiration of the morning business, I shall call up the pending joint resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. Continuing the reading where I was interrupted, the commission says:

Without this file it is impossible to state the purpose for which the money was expended, but the generalization "contributions to campaign committee," in the light of the practices indulged in by the syndicate in question, is clearly suggestive.

The books of the railway company reveal payments aggregating \$44,066.05 to the Denver Post. The vouchers attached read, "for advertising in editorial and news columns." Other entries show that three of these vouchers, aggregating \$20,000, cover a refund that this newspaper received at the rate of 25 cents per hundred on its freight carried over the lines of the railway company from points in Wisconsin.

Another voucher is for \$50,000 to S. M. Felton, for the railway's proportion of amount "paid by E. H. Harriman and his associates for money expended by them to secure the discontinuance of a line of road being constructed in 1900 between Peoria, Ill., and Clinton, Iowa, as per agreement between R. R. Cable, chairman of the board, and E. H. Harriman."

The commission, in considering an arrangement which this company had then with the St. Louis & San Francisco Railway, wind up their comment by saying:

The final result of this transaction is that the railway company has sustained a loss estimated to be about \$6,500,000.

Speaking of another deal they say:

Its net loss from this transaction, including interest, was \$906,420, and this, added to its loss in connection with the other coal company above referred to—

This was in regard to the purchase of the stock of another coal company—

makes a total loss of more than \$1,300,000 as a result of its coal deals. If the advances to the coal companies can not be collected it will result in an additional loss of \$2,500,000.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that when this loss occurred to the railway company the officers of the railroad company composing the syndicate that was in the deal always made what the railroad company lost.

The aggregate losses sustained by the railway company in connection with the foregoing transactions may be summarized as follows.

And then they itemize it. I will put those in the Record, with the permission of the Senate, without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AGGREGATE OF LOSSES.

The aggregate losses sustained by the railway company in connection with the foregoing transactions may be summarized as follows:

Expenses of maintaining and housing holding companies, more than	\$290,000.00
Frisco deal, approximately	6,500,000.00
Alton deal, approximately	6,370,000.00
Trinity & Brazos Valley Railway deal, more than	4,500,000.00
Consolidated Indiana and Dering coal companies, at least	1,300,000.00
Contributions or gratuities to officers and directors, about	1,000,000.00
Venner transaction	217,000.00
Miscellaneous and unexplained expenditures	72,523.45

These items show an aggregate loss to the railway company of more than \$20,000,000. In addition thereto, it is to be noted that prior to June 30, 1914, the railway company paid to financial institutions, in connection with the issuance of bonds, commissions aggregating more than \$1,600,000, and suffered discounts of more than \$17,700,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, they were unable to get all the facts in regard to all these transactions. In one case Mr. Reid, when

interrogated with a view to ascertaining his profits from the various transactions, explained that he always burned his books at the end of each month. Mr. Reid was one of the board of directors, and he drew a salary of \$32,000 a year.

In speaking of the deal with the Consolidated Indiana Coal Co. they say:

Although R. A. Jackson, vice president and general counsel of the railway company, was receiving a salary of \$50,000 a year, he was paid \$10,000 by the railway company to draw up the incorporation papers—

Of another company, remember.

The price paid for the coal property owned by the consolidated company was estimated to be substantially more than it was actually worth, and ever since its incorporation it has been operated at a loss.

Prior to June 30, 1914, the railway company had made advances to the coal company aggregating \$2,354,453.19. The railway company received interest on these loans at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, computed monthly, up to June 30, 1910, when all such interest payments were discontinued. The loss on the part of the railway company attributable to this venture can not be computed exactly, but the loss in interest charges alone since 1910 has amounted to more than \$400,000. As the operation of the coal company has for some time been conducted at a loss, there is little prospect of the railway company being reimbursed for the advances made by it.

Now, Mr. President, this railroad company went into the hands of a receiver. This syndicate, organized mainly by men who were officers of the company, put it in the hands of a receiver when it was unnecessary to go there, and they did it because it was to their financial profit to do it. The commission said:

The syndicate decided to put the railway into a receivership—

Now listen to this—

The general counsel of the railway company, at the suggestion of W. H. Moore, a member of the syndicate, drew the bill asking for a receivership, and engaged an attorney, ostensibly to represent the other side. The bill was placed in the hands of this attorney, with the name of the complainant omitted, and he was instructed by the general counsel to locate some creditor of the railway company willing to act as complainant.

Now, here were the officers of a railroad company, drawing large salaries, going around over the country to find a creditor of the company who would make a complaint asking for the appointment of a receiver. They draw the papers and put them in the hands of another attorney and send him out to hunt such a person who was willing to be made plaintiff. Here we find the officers of the company hunting some one to bring suit against them, and when they found him they confessed judgment in the suit they persuaded him to bring. This is high finance with a vengeance. We ought to tell the President that no investigation is necessary to remedy such highway robbery.

But let us read further of the doings of these financial comedians. The commission go on as follows:

There was an agreement between the general counsel and this attorney as to the parties the latter would recommend to the court as receivers, the general counsel agreeing to instruct the attorney appearing for the railway company to acquiesce in the recommendation so made.

The board of directors of the railway company was not informed of the intention to file a bill for receivership, and at no meeting of the board was any authority ever given for such action. Members of the board of directors not in the confidence of the syndicate were kept in ignorance of the fact that such a bill had been prepared. The stockholders had no information of the purpose to put the railway company into a receivership, although a stockholders' meeting was held after the date upon which the receivership bill was completed by the general counsel, and this general counsel attended the meeting. According to the testimony, the bill was completed by the general counsel March 29, 1915, and the fact that it was to be filed whenever desired by those in authority was known only to certain insiders. The testimony clearly establishes the fact that the railway company could easily have paid the debt of \$10,000 upon which the receivership application was based, and that arrangements probably could have been made to meet all pressing obligations of the railway company.

The creditor at whose instance the receivership application was filed appeared as complainant by request. R. P. Lamont, the president of the American Steel Foundries, the complainant, testified that he would not have thought of bringing such a proceeding against the railway company unless he had understood that it would be regarded as not unfriendly, but as a friendly act to oblige the railway company. He only consented that his company should appear as complainant when he was assured that this course was in accordance with the wishes of the railway company and that his company was not to have any care or expense in the preparation of papers or payment of counsel fees. The suit was not a bona fide proceeding to collect a debt, but was instituted to carry out the purpose and schemes of the syndicate controlling the railway.

It is a forceful commentary on the methods by which a great railway may be manipulated into a receivership when it is noted that the general counsel, after drawing the bill for a receivership, sold his stock, and the local counsel, who represented the railway company in the receivership proceedings, owned no stock in the railway company, and that none of those directly participating in the receivership proceedings had any financial interest in the railway company. The real owners of the railway, the stockholders, the security holders, and the directors, except those composing the syndicate and in its confidence, were in ignorance of the receivership application.

The property of the railway company will be called upon for many years to make up the drain upon its resources resulting from transactions outside the proper sphere in which stockholders had a right to suppose their moneys were invested. This record emphasizes the

need of railway directors who actually direct. There are too many passive directors who acquiesce in what is being done without knowledge and without investigation. A director of a railroad is a quasi public official who occupies a position of trust. A director who submits blindly to the exploitation of his company is a party to its undoing, and he should be held responsible to the same extent as if he had been a principal instead of an accessory before the fact. The greater his prominence the greater his responsibility and the greater his dereliction. Obviously a man of large affairs could not attend to all the details in intricate transactions, but it is inconceivable that a director of ordinary business prudence and sagacity would sanction large expenditures without an inquiry as to the purposes of such disbursements. So long as this situation exists, however, it suggests the need of a law to charge such directors with individual responsibility for the dissipation of corporate funds.

There is a recommendation to the committee of the need of a law to charge the directors with individual responsibility for the dissipation of corporate funds. Now, they conclude:

The Clayton Antitrust Act—

Says the commission—

which becomes effective October 15, 1915, will make it unlawful for any person at the same time to be a director in two or more competing corporations, any one of which has a capital, surplus, or undivided profits aggregating more than \$1,000,000, but common carriers are expressly exempted from its application. It should be just as grave an offense for an official of a railway to be faithless to his trust for financial gain as it is for an elected official of the Government to betray his trust for money reward.

By this case the need of some limitations—

Here is another recommendation—

on the issuance of stocks and bonds by common carriers, whether directly or through holding-company devices or otherwise, is again demonstrated.

Mr. President, in this case the men who were occupying positions of trust, employees of the corporation, after they had run the value of the stock of the Rock Island road in 10 years from \$200 down to \$20, not satisfied with that, formed a syndicate composed of themselves and some financial men outside the railroad company with the deliberate purpose of putting the railroad company in the hands of a receiver. Their own attorney, drawing a salary paid by the stockholders, drew at their direction the bill to file in the court asking that a receiver be appointed.

Then he went out and hunted a man who was a creditor and brought him back as the complainant in the case. This was unknown to the balance of the directors. It was unknown to the stockholders, although that general attorney, drawing a salary, as I said, was present at a stockholders' meeting with that bill in his pocket. Secretly they combined to do this and to hold off until they manipulated the stock that they owned, as the report said, and made money out of it, and then filed the bill, and made no objection, of course, on the part of the railroad company, although the commission says it was a fictitious suit, and consented to the appointment of a receiver, and had an arrangement in advance that some of the very conspirators who were in it, not satisfied with the ill-gotten gains they had made so far, should be appointed receivers.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. What was the name of that attorney?

Mr. NORRIS. He was at the time the general counsel of the railroad company. I do not see his name here. I do not believe I have the name of the general attorney.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator does an injustice to one very good man. The receivers appointed for the Rock Island were not both of them conspirators.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not think they were.

Mr. KENYON. I understand it was arranged that the conspirators should be appointed, but the court rather shocked the financial looters by appointing Judge Dickinson as one of the receivers. The other receiver since that time has retired and is defendant in a suit brought against himself and several others by Judge Dickinson, as receiver, for a great many million dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Iowa. I perhaps would have forgotten to mention that; I, of course, do not want to do any injustice to Judge Dickinson. My judgment is that he is perfectly competent and perfectly honest, and he is doing very good work as receiver.

Mr. KENYON. I know that Judge Dickinson opposed it just as much as the Senator would have done.

Mr. NORRIS. I submit that the conspirators never had Judge Dickinson in mind. They had their own men alone in mind, and they instructed the other attorney they employed to represent the other side to consent. But it is true, as the Senator from Iowa says—and I am very glad that he has said it—the court refused to carry out the disreputable scheme, and appointed Judge Dickinson as one of the receivers.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is familiar, is he not, with this suit that Judge Dickinson as a receiver has brought against these eminent men?

Mr. NORRIS. I knew the suit was pending, and I think it is still pending.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who was honoring me with his presence but has gotten weary and retired, asked me if I was going to suggest any remedy.

Mr. President, I wish to suggest a remedy. The Interstate Commerce Commission has suggested it in various opinions I have read, but in the syllabus of one of the cases they substantially specify what they think ought to be done. I want to read that:

In the opinion of the commission the following propositions lie at the foundation of all adequate regulation of interstate railroads: (a) Every interstate railroad should be prohibited from expending money or incurring liability or acquiring property not in the operation of its railroad or in the legitimate improvement, extension, or development of that railroad; (b) no interstate railroad should be permitted to lease or purchase any other railroad, nor to acquire the stocks or securities of any other railroad, nor to guarantee the same, directly or indirectly, without the approval of the Federal Government; (c) no stocks or bonds should be issued by an interstate railroad except for the purposes sanctioned in the two preceding paragraphs, and none should be issued without the approval of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, there has been a bill of mine pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee since January 9, 1914, that I think specifically meets the suggestion made not only by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but that would commend itself to any man who would read the evidence and the reports of the investigation made by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the various railroads to which I have alluded. We ought to have a law, and we can have it. We ought to have it, it seems to me, without any further investigation than is necessary to put the bill itself in proper shape so as to do the things that they have marked out. In addition I think it ought specifically to provide that the corporation injured shall have an action against the persons who do the injury, and that if the corporation itself refuses to take the necessary steps, any stockholder can take such steps, and in such a case he ought to be allowed to recover as part of the judgment attorney fees.

The same bill has been introduced in this Congress. It is S. 3669. It provides—

That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, subject to the provisions of this act, to purchase, either directly or indirectly, the stock or the corporate property of any other corporation without having first obtained the consent in writing of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall not grant such consent until after investigation and examination it is satisfied that the ownership of such stock or corporate property is not intended as a device or subterfuge, and that the same is fairly necessary for the purpose of carrying out the proper and legitimate objects and duties of such common carrier.

Any officer—

Now we come to the penalty. It seems to me that that is important, and in this bill there is in every instance a criminal penalty—

Any officer, member of the board of directors, or other official or employee of such common carrier who shall use any of its funds, or vote in favor of the use of such funds, to acquire the stock or other property of such subsidiary corporation without the consent in writing as aforesaid of the Interstate Commerce Commission having been duly given, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000 and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than six months nor more than two years.

Will any honest director object to that? Can there be any possibility of injuring any such man if that were placed on the statute books? If that had been on the statute books, do you suppose these things would have happened? It would have been impossible, particularly if one of the other sections were placed there, to conceive that men, in the face of that kind of law, would have violated it.

I believe, Mr. President, if this had been on the statute books the story of the New Haven and Frisco and Rock Island would not have been necessary. They would have been doing now what they were doing when the conspirators undertook to ruin them, a legitimate, profitable, and honest business.

Here is another section:

SEC. 20b. That the board of directors of every common carrier subject to the provisions of this act shall keep correct and accurate minutes of all the proceedings of said board. Such minutes shall clearly show, without any equivocation or concealment, the expenditures of all moneys authorized to be expended, a correct description of all properties purchased, all contracts entered into, and all other business transacted by said board. Such minutes shall at all times be open to the inspection of any stockholder and to the inspection of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its duly authorized agents. In the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission such minutes or any part of the same may be made public.

Then follows a penalty for the violation of that provision.

Mr. President, if those two sections had been on the statute books the sad tales that are only illustrative of the possibilities which may exist under our laws as they stand now could not have been told.

Would such provisions injure an honest man? Can any honest director say that by any possibility he could have been injured if he was doing his duty honestly, if this had been the law?

There are two other sections in this bill, Mr. President, meeting the other conditions which the Interstate Commerce Commission has shown ought to be remedied. I ask, without reading it, that the entire bill may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill (S. 3669) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, to provide for certain penalties, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 20 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, be further amended by adding to said section 20, sections 20a, 20b, 20c, and 20d, as follows:

"SEC. 20a. That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, subject to the provisions of this act, to purchase, either directly or indirectly, the stock or the corporate property of any other corporation without having first obtained the consent in writing of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall not grant such consent until after investigation and examination it is satisfied that the ownership of such stock or corporate property is not intended as a device or subterfuge, and that the same is fairly necessary for the purpose of carrying out the proper and legitimate objects and duties of such common carrier.

"Any officer, member of the board of directors, or other official or employee of such common carrier who shall use any of its funds, or vote in favor of the use of such funds, to acquire the stock or other property of such subsidiary corporation without the consent in writing as aforesaid of the Interstate Commerce Commission having been duly given, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000 and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than six months nor more than two years.

"SEC. 20b. That the board of directors of every common carrier subject to the provisions of this act shall keep correct and accurate minutes of all the proceedings of said board. Such minutes shall clearly show, without any equivocation or concealment, the expenditures of all moneys authorized to be expended, a correct description of all properties purchased, all contracts entered into, and all other business transacted by said board. Such minutes shall at all times be open to the inspection of any stockholder and to the inspection of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its duly authorized agents. In the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission such minutes or any part of the same may be made public.

"Any officer of such common carrier, or member of the board of directors thereof, or secretary or other officer of said board, who shall conceal any item of expenditure of money, or purchase of any property, or make any false notation or entry in the books or records of such common carrier for the purpose of such concealment, or who shall assist in making any attempt to conceal the same so that the expenditure of said money or the purchase of said property shall not be fairly and honestly shown by the records of such common carrier, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$5,000, and shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than 1 year nor more than 10 years.

"Any officer or member of the board of directors of such common carrier, or any person acting as fiscal or financial agent of the same, who shall, either directly or indirectly, instruct, advise, or request any official or employee of said common carrier to make any false or misleading record or entry upon the books or records of said common carrier, with the purpose of concealing or covering up any expenditure of any money or the acquisition of any property or of the perpetrating of any other deception in connection with the business of such common carrier, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000, and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than 3 years nor more than 12 years.

"SEC. 20c. That any officer, member of the board of directors, attorney, agent, or other employee of any common carrier subject to the provisions of this act who shall, either directly or indirectly, pay any money, or give any ticket or pass, or other property of such common carrier to any public official of the United States, or of any State, county, municipality, or district, for the purpose of influencing or controlling such official in the performance of any official act, or who shall use any of such funds or property of such common carrier for the purpose of wrongfully and fraudulently influencing or controlling any National, State, county, or municipal board or commission, or other public official in the granting, changing, or withholding of any privilege, right, claim, franchise, or right of way, or who shall use any of the money, tickets, passes, or other property of such common carrier for the purpose of influencing or controlling any political committee, convention, primary, or election, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000 and shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term of not less than 1 year nor more than 15 years.

"SEC. 20d. That any person guilty of any of the offenses charged in section 20a, section 20b, or section 20c shall be personally liable to said common carrier and to the stockholders thereof for any loss or damage resulting from such illegal act, and the stockholders of said common carrier, either singly or collectively, are hereby authorized to maintain an action in any court having jurisdiction for the recovery of such loss or damage. If, after being requested so to do by any stockholder, the officials of such common carrier refuse or neglect to begin such action, and the same is commenced by a stockholder or stockholders and judgment is rendered in his or their favor, the expense of such litigation, together with fair and reasonable attorney fees, shall be a lawful claim against such common carrier, and can be recovered in any court having jurisdiction."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in conclusion let me ask, Is any investigation necessary by a joint committee to gather additional evidence? Is it not up to us to remedy the situation? How can men longer delay when time after time the instrumentalities of government which we have provided by law have called our attention and the attention of the world to these financial conditions that can be so easily remedied by the enactment of a simple statute? Does any man doubt that they ought to be remedied? Is there any man who wants to stand up here or elsewhere and say that the story that can be told of these railroads, as the Interstate Commerce Commission intimates, may be told any day with regard to another railroad? It seems to me, in the face of platform pledges made by our Democratic friends, in the face of the official recommendation of the President that we should meet this proposition, that we ought to pay no attention to the other recommendation of the Chief Executive, wherein he turns his back upon the course that he had so bravely started out to follow, and asks us to be silent.

Mr. President, I fear, if this resolution is enacted, that from now on we shall always be met, when we undertake to remedy this situation, with the proposition that this is a subject under investigation by a joint committee and that, therefore, we shall do nothing.

It seems to me that the time to act is now; that before this Congress adjourns we ought to enact some law that would remedy this situation, though there are those who say that we have legislated too much in reference to the railroads and other corporations and do not need any further legislation. If it was harassing, that objection might be good; but this is not adding any difficulty to regulation. It is simply compelling men who occupy positions of trust to be honest; that is all. No man ought to object to that, unless he wants to indulge in such financial operations as have brought ruin to many of these stockholders.

It is not only stockholders, as everybody knows, who are ruined and injured, but, of course, the general public in the end are also injured; other investors are injured; honest railroad men are injured; honest men who want to make honest investments in railroad stocks and bonds are injured, because under the present conditions they do not want to go into a gambling institution and run the risk of losing their savings.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that anything I may say in support of the bill now before the Senate, together with the amendment proposed by the learned Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], would be a twice-told tale vexing the dull ears of a drowsy Senate. I have been very much interested and entertained by the multiplicity of plans and the variety of programs for the settlement of this great problem. The point from which the question is viewed by different Senators and the widely varying shades of thought and conclusions presents rather an interesting psychological phenomenon.

I am reminded of a plan proposed by a black-faced comedian whom I heard some weeks ago. Borrowing from Mr. Dooley, he said that when Dewey sank the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, he did not know whether the Philippines were canned goods or islands, but now he said he knows they are islands; he knows they are an issue, and he knows they are "a darned nuisance." He said, however, that he was not in favor of selling them to Japan or of giving them to Russia or to China, but he believed in home consumption and home production, and he was going to the next Democratic convention and propose a plank for the platform which would provide that we should swap these islands to England for Ireland and raise our own policemen. [Laughter.] That seems to me just about as reasonable and in accord with the eternal fitness of things as some of the other plans which have been proposed for the settlement of this problem.

Mr. President, it is rather unfortunate that every question considered by the Senate these days must bear the burden or take the coloring of the Senatorial mind upon what is called "Preparedness"—a term which I fear will stand out in American history as a colossal marker of the turning point in the life of this Nation. Well, I rather think the Philippine question has something to do with "preparedness." There is no doubt in my mind, while I have no fear whatever, and do not think any nation beneath the stars is thinking about or has ever seriously thought about attacking the United States through the

Philippine Islands—still as a matter of fact if such an attack is contemplated by any nation, or if an attack should be made at any time in the future by a foreign power, there is no question but that the Philippine Islands would be the Achilleian heel at which they would first shoot. It is the most vulnerable point in all of the American possessions. The remoteness from our shores and the heterogeneity of the population all contribute to the vulnerability of the situation. I do not think, however, that we ought to be moved in the settlement of this problem by apprehension of remote contingencies or difficulties which may arise in the future, all of which seem to be magnified by the distorted visions of statesmen who are apparently suffering from the effects of abnormal environment.

I repeat emphatically, that I do not believe there is a nation on earth that ever thought seriously of taking the Philippine Islands from the United States, and I am very sure there is not a nation on earth that could take the Philippine Islands from the United States and hold them against our wishes. As was very eloquently and ably stated by the learned Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], on yesterday, the affluence of whose eloquence and strength of argument always appeals compellingly to me, these questions should be settled upon their own merits—they must be solved, if at all, as they would be in normal times, and the legislative mind should not be moved by the hobgoblins and ghosts that appear in the shadows caused by the crimson torch of war, or the specters in the brains of those who are suffering from the effect of this wave of war lust which is sweeping over the country and temporarily dethroning the reasons of men throughout the world. Let the deliberate judgment of the American statesmen, unmoved by fear, unclouded by the greed for gain, undisturbed by the lust for power, or the pride of empire, assume the reins of government and settle these questions for the future as well as for the immediate present. We should not forget that to-day, well lived, will have a far-reaching effect upon the affairs of to-morrow.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to think profoundly, and I do feel deeply, on this question of "preparedness." There are fundamental objections to it which the superficial observer, I fear, may overlook. Beneath the gilded crest are concealed pernicious policies which will override, indeed absolutely destroy, the vital principles of Democracy, and, unless we shall be careful, overthrow our free institutions. I am one of those who believe that to do the biddings of predatory interests, the goal of whose every effort is big profits, or to follow the lead of the military experts whose natural leanings are for a greater Navy and bigger Army, whose tastes naturally lead them rather to prefer absolute to free government—I say for this administration to follow the lead of such influences will be a mistake, the disastrous consequences of which posterity shall be unable to correct. To express my opposition to "preparedness," as that term is now understood, with its train of inevitable evils, I find it rather difficult to command language. The poverty of my own vocabulary causes me to reach out for help. That my feelings may be vocalized and my thoughts uttered I am going to adopt the language of another whose genius for expression is world renowned, as the better expression of my own views. That which I shall quote from him came as the limpid water from the spring of pure Democracy, unclouded by the mud of politics and untainted with the poison of personal interests. The craving for reelection—the lure of place—the pride of power—and the flattery of pampered interests had not fastened their clammy clutches upon his heart and fired his ambition. The arguments he made then are unanswerable, because he stated the truth, unalloyed by selfish interest. Speaking on the question of "preparedness," the necessity for quadrupling our Army and doubling our Navy, thus outraging the genius of our Government, violating the history and traditions of the Democratic Party, and as the legitimate consequence of illegitimate conditions, piling up higher, and higher still, the burden of taxation upon the backs of the toiling millions of this country, that distinguished citizen said:

"It can not be discussed without first answering some very searching questions. It is said in some quarters that we are not prepared for war. What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready upon brief notice to put a nation in the field, a nation of men trained to arms? Of course we are not ready to do that; and we never shall be in time of peace so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions. And what is it that it is suggested we should be prepared to do? To defend ourselves against attack? We have always found means to do that and shall find them whenever it is necessary without calling our people away from their necessary tasks to render compulsory military service in time of peace.

"Allow me to speak with great plainness and directness upon this great matter and to avow my convictions with deep earnestness. I have tried to know what America is, what her

people think, what they are, what they most cherish and hold dear. I hope that some of their finer passions are in my own heart—some of the great conceptions and desires which gave birth to this Government and which have made the voice of this people a voice of peace and hope and liberty among the peoples of the world; and that, speaking my own thoughts, I shall, at least in part, speak theirs also, however faintly and inadequately, upon this vital matter.

"We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel based on fact or drawn from a just and candid interpretation of realities can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or the integrity of our territory is threatened. Dread of the power of any other nation we are incapable of. We are not jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce or of any other peaceful achievement. We mean to live our own lives as we will; but we mean also to let live. We are, indeed, a true friend to all the nations of the world, because we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none. Our friendship can be accepted and is accepted without reservation, because it is offered in a spirit and for a purpose which no one need ever question or suspect. Therein lies our greatness. We are the champions of peace and of concord. And we should be very jealous of this distinction which we have sought to earn. Just now we should be particularly jealous of it, because it is our dearest present hope that this character and reputation may presently, in God's providence, bring us an opportunity such as has seldom been vouchsafed any nation, the opportunity to counsel and obtain peace in the world and reconciliation and a healing settlement of many a matter that has cooled and interrupted the friendship of nations. This is the time above all others when we should wish and resolve to keep our strength by self-possession, our influence by preserving our ancient principles of action.

"From the first we have had a clear and settled policy with regard to military establishments. We never have had, and while we retain our present principles and ideals we never shall have, a large standing army. If asked, Are you ready to defend yourselves? we reply, Most assuredly, to the utmost; and yet we shall not turn America into a military camp. We will not ask our young men to spend the best years of their lives making soldiers of themselves. There is another sort of energy in us. It will know how to declare itself and make itself effective should occasion arise. And especially when half the world is on fire we shall be careful to make our moral insurance against the spread of the conflagration very definite and certain and adequate indeed.

"Let us remind ourselves, therefore, of the only thing we can do or will do. We must depend in every time of national peril, in the future as in the past, not upon a standing army, nor yet upon a reserve army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms. It will be right enough, right American policy, based upon our accustomed principles and practices, to provide a system by which every citizen who will volunteer for the training may be made familiar with the use of modern arms, the rudiments of drill and maneuver, and the maintenance and sanitation of camps. We should encourage such training and make it a means of discipline which our young men will learn to value. It is right that we should provide it not only, but that we should make it as attractive as possible, and so induce our young men to undergo it at such times as they can command a little freedom and can seek the physical development they need, for mere health's sake, if for nothing else. Every means by which such things can be stimulated is legitimate, and such a method smacks of true American ideas. It is right, too, that the National Guard of the States should be developed and strengthened by every means which is not inconsistent with our obligations to our own people or with the established policy of our Government. And this, also, not because the time or occasion specially calls for such measures, but because it should be our constant policy to make these provisions for our national peace and safety.

"More than this carries with it a reversal of the whole history and character of our polity. More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession, that we had been thrown off our balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes can not touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble. This is assuredly the opportunity for which a people and a Government like ours were raised up, the opportunity not only to speak but actually to embody and exemplify the counsels of peace and amity and the lasting concord which is based on justice and fair and generous dealing.

"A powerful Navy we have always regarded as our proper and natural means of defense; and it has always been of defense that we have thought, never of aggression or of conquest. But who shall tell us what sort of Navy to build? We shall take leave to be strong upon the seas, in the future as in the past; and there will be no thought of offense or of provocation in that. Our ships are our natural bulwarks. When will the experts tell us just what kind we should construct, and when will they be right for 10 years together, if the relative efficiency of craft of different kinds and uses continues to change as we have seen it change under our very eyes in these last few months?

"But I turn away from the subject. It is not new. There is no new need to discuss it. We shall not alter our attitude toward it because some amongst us are nervous and excited. We shall easily and sensibly agree upon a policy of defense. The question has not changed its aspects because the times are not normal. Our policy will not be for an occasion. It will be conceived as a permanent and settled thing, which we will pursue at all seasons, without haste and after a fashion perfectly consistent with the peace of the world, the abiding friendship of states, and the unhampered freedom of all with whom we deal. Let there be no misconception. The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of national defense. We are not unmindful of the great responsibility resting upon us. We shall learn and profit by the lesson of every experience and every new circumstance; and what is needed will be adequately done."

Mr. President, I wish merely to add to this quotation, that of all the times in the history of this Republic when our duty to the world demands that this Government shall talk peace, and act peace, and pray peace, and counsel peace, now is the time above all others to do it. If, after this conflagration which is sweeping over Europe, making of that fair land a veritable Golgotha, shall have ceased its ravages, the good offices which we ought to propose as a government to lead the war-mad nations of the earth back into the paths of peace shall be rejected or spurned, we shall have sufficient time then to talk about converting the American Republic into an armed camp. If the arbitrament of the sword must be the supreme law governing the world, the United States Government will be in a position to raise and equip larger armies, build bigger navies, and otherwise prepare ourselves for the great conflict of the future than any other country on the globe. But I am opposed to making this radical departure until we shall have exhausted every honorable and proper effort to lift the nations of the world out of the bogs and mire of brute force and place them upon the high plane of Christian civilization. It strikes me that to entertain any other view and pursue any other course brands our pretended faith in the Prince of Peace as a bloody lie; and our boasted civilization savagery thinly veneered. The extraordinary efforts of the President and other prominent advocates of militarism to force through Congress without proper consideration the "preparedness" bills can be accounted for only upon the theory that they realize, in order to bring about this radical departure from our time-honored custom, the iron must be welded while the war spirit is at white heat. They realize that the extraordinary character of the scheme can only be accomplished while the public mind is in a fevered state. I regard such efforts as a betrayal of the Democratic Party and a capital crime against posterity.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate at this time carries with it a recognition of the God-given right of the Filipino to govern himself in his own country as his best judgment may dictate and his interests demand. It also redeems a promise which the American people gave to the Filipino when our Army planted the American flag upon that foreign land as an emblem of American authority without extending to its people the protective ægis of the Constitution. Whatever others may think, say, or do, I still believe that nations ought to respect their moral obligations, political parties fulfill their platform promises, sacredly as the private citizen demands that his neighbor shall observe and absolve his voluntarily assumed obligations. I have no more respect for the integrity of a political party, or the leaders of political parties who violate their platform promises, than I have for the integrity of the man who obtains goods under false pretenses, or the fidelity to the law of the highwayman who relieves the innocent wayfarer of his money at the point of a pistol. There can be no two distinct codes of morals for the individual and the Nation. It was thought after the sovereignty of Spain had ceased in the Philippine Islands by force of American arms that it was the duty of the American Government to aid the Filipinos in the establishment of a government of their own. No patriotic citizen of this Republic at that time imagined that the tyranny of Spain was

to be succeeded by American usurpation—our work was altruistic, and the good of the Filipino was the end devoutly sought. We were to assist these people, untrained in the art of self-government, to bring order out of chaos, to establish a government for them, to render just such aid as might be necessary until they should become accustomed to the uses of sovereignty, and after that to retire from the islands, wishing them Godspeed. As an evidence that that was the purpose of the American people, especially those who maintain allegiance to the Democratic Party—the party now in power and commissioned by the American people to direct the affairs of their Government—I am going to ask permission to insert just here as a part of my remarks the planks in the platform of the years 1900 and 1904, 1908 and 1912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the Republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not be citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not be subjects without imperiling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization nor to convert the Republic into an empire we favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay; but even this sordid and unworthy plea falls when brought to the test of facts. The war of criminal aggression against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high. (Platform, 1900.)

IMPERIALISM.

We favor the preservation, so far as we can, of an open door for the world's commerce in the Orient, without an unnecessary entanglement in Oriental and European affairs, and without arbitrary, unlimited, irresponsible, and absolute government anywhere within our jurisdiction.

We oppose, as fervently as did George Washington himself, an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary, and vague absolutism and a policy of colonial exploitation, no matter where or by whom invoked or exercised. We believe, with Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, that no government has a right to make one set of laws for those "at home" and another and a different set of laws, absolute in their character, for those "in the colonies." All men under the American flag are entitled to the protection of the institutions whose emblem the flag is. If they are inherently unfit for those institutions, then they are inherently unfit to be members of the American body politic. Wherever there may exist a people incapable of being governed under American laws, in consonance with the American Constitution, the territory of that people ought not to be part of the American domain.

FILIPINOS AND CUBANS.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guaranties of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident. (Platform, 1904.)

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us, as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases. (Platform, 1908.)

THE PHILIPPINES.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases. (Platform, 1912.)

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think anybody thought of our Government remaining in control of the Philippine Islands permanently until the speculator, the financial buccaneer, the commercial bandit caught a vision of what appeared to be opportunities for speculation and the acquisition of wealth. The fertile valleys then occupied by the peaceful natives, the great forests of valuable timber, and the mines buried beneath the mountains in that remote island empire excited the greed and cupidity of the American and stirred to the depths his avaricious spirit—a quality, I am sorry to say, characteristic of

the Anglo-Saxon race. At that moment, and not until then, was born the purpose of permanent occupancy, benevolent American control, and the recognition of our God-imposed duty to lead the Filipino to a state of moral and intellectual excellency which could only be attained after generations of American discipline and control.

It is a peculiarity of human nature that whenever a man or a nation desires to do anything of questionable propriety they at once undertake to discover the unseen hand of Infinity leading them on or beckoning them to come. They always try to charge their diabolism to God Almighty. Rivers of blood have been shed, ambitions frustrated, and hopes blighted in the name of liberty or for the glory of God—while in truth it was all done to serve sinister, selfish ends, promote kingly ambition, or gratify royal vanity. I believe that if the personal profits to be derived from our holding the Philippine Islands were eliminated the opposition to this bill would dwindle in a day, and I want to say just in this connection further, Mr. President, that the longer American sovereignty exists in the Philippine Islands, the further you postpone the day of American withdrawal, the greater will be the vested interests by Americans, and therefore the more stubborn the opposition to restoring independence to the Filipino. Now let us consider for a moment what it has cost the American people in blood and treasure to take the Philippine Islands. It is variously estimated in dollars and cents to be somewhere between six hundred million and a billion dollars up to date, and it will cost something like \$30,000,000 per annum to retain them in the future. That is the cost in dollars and cents, which is trivial compared to the cost in blood. A thousand American soldiers have been sacrificed in subduing the Filipinos and maintaining American authority there. How many brave boys suffering with tropical diseases have become incurably sick and insane, God alone can tell. The Filipinos have suffered also. In addition to having their rights violated, their homes despoiled, their country invaded, and every sense of right and justice outraged, they have suffered grievously in blood. It is stated by Judge Blount in his work on "American Occupation of the Philippines," page 395:

"In Batangas Province alone from 50,000 to 100,000 people died due to war, pestilence, and famine. According to the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey Atlas of the Philippines, Batangas in 1899 had a population of 312,192. The census of 1903 gives the population as 257,715. This means a casualty of 54,477. On December 15, 1901, the provincial secretary of Batangas reported that the war "had reduced to a little over 200,000 the more than 300,000 inhabitants which in former years the Province had."

Mr. Willis, in a work entitled "Our Philippine Problem," page 23, makes this remarkable statement: "Gen. J. F. Bell estimated in 1902 that one-sixth of the natives in Luzon died as a direct or indirect result of the war. This would put the death roll at at least 600,000 persons."

In the name of justice, Mr. President, if our people were not hardened by the greed for gold and the avarice for empire such a statement would so shock their sensibilities that the refusal of Congress to repair in part even at this late day the damage done, would visit upon the Members of Congress the scorpion lash of their disapproval and utter repudiation. And in the face of this fact which I have not heard disputed we are told that we are "holding these people for their betterment—to uplift them, convert them to the Christian faith, teach them the story of the Prince of Peace." I imagine that a religion of love that must be inoculated or taught by the use of a Krag Jorgeson rifle or a gatling gun as the hypodermic syringe with which to inject it will not be accepted with any degree of joy by the benighted savages of the Orient. Oh, no, Mr. President, this Congress can not be deceived by such duplicity, disingenuousness, and insincerity. There was no altruism in taking the islands against the wishes of the inhabitants thereof. There can be no philanthropy in retaining them longer.

I have never been able to understand the brand of a man's morals who would be in favor of robbing the American taxpayers for the purpose of maintaining sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and use the money taken from the American against his consent and force the Filipino to accept our benefactions against his wishes. But Senators tell us while "we ought not to have gone to the Philippine Islands at all; that, having gone there, we can not with grace or propriety retire." Rather strange logic, is it not? We have committed a mistake and committed it in an effort to render an unselfish service, but we can not rectify or correct the error without being guilty of infidelity to a trust. With all due respect, such contention does not arise to the dignity of second-class nonsense. It does not deceive anybody, either. If we made a mistake when we went to the Philippine Islands and drove out the Spaniards, murdered the

Filipinos and usurped the powers of government, the way to correct that mistake is to come away—give back to the Filipinos that which we have withheld from them—leave with them our blessings and sail away to the westward.

Mr. President, if the United States Government had done its duty to the Filipino in the beginning there never would have been a hand raised by the Filipino against American assistance. If we had assured them we were there to assist them in the construction and upbuilding of their own government and the moment we completed that work we were going to retire and leave them to work out their own salvation, assisted by our prayers, precepts, and kindly offices, they would have looked upon us as friends rather than enemies. But they knew we were not there for their betterment, and they know it now. They believed then, and they believed right, that their country was being held in order that certain American citizens might exploit them, rob them of their birthright. And now we are asked, for the good of the Filipino, to add to the crime of plunder the sin of deception. It will not do. There is nothing, however, new or unusual in this entire transaction. History is full of such instances. It is another evidence that human nature does not change. It is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever. But it is contended the Filipino is not capable of self-government. The English historian, Anthony Froude, said: "Popular forms of government are possible only where individual men can govern themselves on moral principles and when duty is of more importance than pleasure and justice than material expediency."

That is the Anglo-Saxon standard. When measured by that standard the Filipino will fall short. But the Filipino must not be measured by the Anglo-Saxon standard for the reason that no other race has ever reached the standard of Anglo-Saxon excellency in the art of self-government. But the Filipino is capable of maintaining a government suitable to his peculiar nature and congenial with his development. Self-government can not be taught. You can not inoculate a man with it as you would administer an anesthetic, nor is it a matter of schoolbook learning. It is rather a capacity born of generations of failures and successes. The evolution of certain truths, wrought by time and trials, that mysterious far-reaching influence of blood, a growing, accumulating, intensifying capacity resulting from generations of practice of the individual until at last it becomes the instinct of the race. No people have ever developed to a high degree the capacity for self-government while they were held as subjects. It is really more a matter of race than education. The illiteracy to-day among the Filipinos, if I have read history right, is not much greater than it was among the Americans when the Constitution of 1787 was adopted, and yet I know it to be a fact that the Filipinos would not be as capable of self-government if every one of them were a college graduate, speaking a half dozen languages, as the Americans were a century and a quarter ago. The fact is I do not believe that the best educated Filipino in the world is as capable of self-government as we practice it in America as the average illiterate sane, sound-minded Anglo-Saxon living in the rural districts of this Republic. Why, Mr. President, the majority of men who extorted the Magna Charta from King John could not read. No, it is not a question of schoolbook learning, but a question of race. Now, as a matter of fact, I do not think the annals of history contain an instance where a mongrel race has ever been able to maintain for any great length of time a stable form of government, and it is not fair to expect too much of the Filipino. Give the Filipino a chance and he will take care of himself—he will work out his own salvation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to suggest to the Senator that some years ago we began to treat the Indians as separate nations, and we made treaties with them. Previous to that time we had great trouble with them, but when we established reservations and told them to go on those reservations, attend to their own affairs, have their own government, elect their own chiefs, and punish their own criminals, except for the crime of murder, they readily did it; and the result has been most wholesome as compared with the conditions which previously existed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There is not any question in the world about that, Mr. President. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And if the Indians obtained that benefit from administering their own affairs, why would not the same be true of a people who are educated, to some extent at least?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I agree with my friend about it. I agree with the Senator most heartily, and the only way you can develop that capacity is to let them exercise it. I have my serious doubts about the Indian maintaining unassisted a government in the form of our own.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VARDAMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Colorado think that the Indians who were upon these reservations were maintaining an independent government, or were they not exercising a sort of local self-government under the absolute control of the United States, precisely what is happening in the Philippines to-day?

Mr. SHAFROTH rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will answer the Senator from Utah. I have no doubt in the world but that the Indians here in America are being treated in the proper way; but I should not be in favor, if the American Indians lived in one of the islands in the Pacific Ocean, of going there and taking charge of them in order to enforce upon them our civilization.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi further yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VARDAMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator from Mississippi thinks the method of governing Indians by putting them in reservations and giving them a certain measure of self-government was the ideal method, can the Senator tell us why he was in favor—as I assume he was, as practically everybody was in favor—of breaking up the reservation system? It is at an end now.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That has no bearing whatever upon this question. The Indians there violated the trusts that were reposed in them, and it was thought that their wild nature should be restrained. But wherever they have shown any capacity for self-government it has always been wise and prudent to permit them to exercise it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator tell us why we have not continued to permit them to exercise those powers?

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact they do, to a very large extent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, we have broken up the reservation system, I think, almost altogether. I do not know of a single reservation of any consequence that is still left.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Why, certainly; they have nearly all been killed out, and we have put the remnant over here in Oklahoma. That would be the effect of the permanent occupancy by the United States of the Philippine Islands. If we hold them indefinitely, it is only a question of time when we would do as we did in the beginning, you know, in order to restrain those who declined to submit to American domination; we simply put them out of the way. People like the Filipino and the Indian always wither in the blasting breath of our benevolent civilization.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But we have gotten rid of the tribal system in Oklahoma. Those people are merged into our own citizenship.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; and they have very largely been merged, in some instances, into our own race—a fact of doubtful benefit to the country.

A thousand years would not qualify the Filipino for self-government as we have it in America, and it is a waste of time to talk about it, but they are capable of maintaining a government good enough for themselves. And that is what this Congress is primarily interested in now. Just for the information of the Senators I want to call attention to the utterances of some of the leaders of public thought on the Philippine Islands. It shows, Mr. President, that the germ is there. They are—

Troubled with the noble discontent
That stirs the acorn to become the oak.

Analyze the profound thought and patriotic fervor attained by the great leader, Dr. Jose Rizal. He said:

I do not mean to say that our liberty will be secured at the sword's point, for the sword plays but little part in modern affairs, but that we must secure it by making ourselves worthy of it, by exalting the intelligence and the dignity of the individual, by loving justice, right, and greatness, even to the extent of dying for them—and when a people reaches that height God will provide a weapon, the idols will be shattered, the tyranny will crumble like a house of cards and liberty will shine out like the first dawn.

No savage breast ever harbored such sentiments as that, and none other than the brain of a statesman ever conceived such noble thoughts. It is superb. It only shows "they love their land because it is their own, and scorn to give aught other reason why."

But it was not vouchsafed to him to see his dream realized, but just before the end came he expressed this sublime sentiment:

I die without seeing the dawn brighten over my native land. You, who have it to see, welcome it, and forget not those who have fallen during the night.

Mr. President, that indicates a deep yearning for liberty, a longing for freedom—and not the "desolate freedom of a wild ass," as somebody has said, but a burning desire to share in the government of his own country. I could quote at length from others who possessed in a marked degree the divine power of forethought:

"Men who, standing in the shadow of the night, were able to look beyond it, toward the coming light, and see far off with trance-prophetic eyes, the consummation of centuries." To deny such men the free use of their power and the gratification of their ambitions in their own country indicates a degree of selfishness on our part which would cause a man to burn down his neighbor's house to roast his eggs. But, Mr. President, I am not so much interested in the Filipino, however great my interest may be, as I am in our own Government. I would not carelessly violate our implied obligations to the interests in the Philippine Islands of American investors. I should like to make provision to protect those who have invested their money there, but, Mr. President, the question of dollars and cents, the question of personal profits, has no important place in this discussion. To say that the Government of the United States would prostitute its powers, punish an innocent, unoffending people, take from them the right to govern themselves in order that a few American financiers might receive large dividends upon their investments, is an affront to the intelligence, patriotism, and integrity of the American Government. We want to do the best we can for the Filipino, and we would also do the best that may be done for the American investor, but our first obligation is to our own country. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on yesterday read an extract from a chapter in Froide's *Cæsar* which I think is very pertinent to this discussion. The historian says:

If there is one lesson which history clearly teaches it is this: That free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

Let us see, to it that our own institutions and our own Government is protected. We should not knowingly do that which will recoil upon us. You can not have one form of government for the Filipino under the American flag and another form of government for the American under the same flag without doing violence to the very fundamentals of our home Government. "Safety first" is my policy. The Filipino is incapable congenitally, racially, unalterably of understanding the genius of our Government. We can not make citizens of them. That fact has been proclaimed by the Democratic Party and has received the constructive approval of the American people. We have experimented with this race question in the United States, and all agree that the body politic can not stand any more of the black virus of incompetency. We all know that race political equality means ultimate social equality—social equality will be followed in turn by race amalgamation—race amalgamation will produce race deterioration—race mongrelization, and that will be followed inevitably by disintegration and death of our civilization. Of course, Mr. President, I am speaking of races as diametrically different as the Negro, the Mongolian, and the white races.

The men and women who conceived our form of government and constructed our Constitution never dreamed we would engage in the business of holding subject provinces. It is therefore our duty to get out of the Philippine Islands and come back home, and come back to stay. In answer to the suggestions of some Senators that this Nation must expand and become a world power, that it is our duty to reach out and lead the benighted into the light, let me say, Mr. President, that is a fine sentiment. I want this Nation to become a world power, but I want it to be a world power for righteousness. I want to see it fulfill the hope and realize the dream of the incomparably great men and women who gave it being. I want to see America the biggest moral example that ever fired the imagination, delighted the human soul, or challenged the intellect of man. I want it to lead the world by its superb example of probity and justice to that high plain where the nations of the earth will adopt the principle of the golden rule rather than the rule of gold to guide them in their inter-

course with each other. I want the American flag to be an emblem of liberty and the token of truth. When I was a boy living in the prostrate and bleeding Southland, after the simoom of war had withered our productive fields and laid waste to our lovely homes, where the gaunt blackened chimneys marked the trace of vandal warfare, our friends of the North were wont to point to the flag with pride and boast that beneath its sacred folds no man should wear shackles. Well, I like to contemplate it in that sense. I like to look upon it as an emblem of liberty, as a pledge of justice, as a guaranty of freedom to the Filipino in his own country as well as to the Americans; but, Mr. President, I am compelled with a sense of shame to admit that instead of the American flag that waves in the tropical breezes above the Philippine Islands being an emblem of liberty to the Filipino, it is an emblem of oppression, and its bright stars are dimmed, its white lines are stained with the tears and blood of an innocent people who have suffered, sacrificed, and died that they might be free and enjoy the liberty of free men in their own country, a privilege which we in America hold more precious than the ruddy drops that feed the patriot's heart. I sincerely hope the amendment proposed by the learned senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] may be agreed to, and the bill as thus amended passed. The American Senate will honor itself by such an act, and justice at last will have triumphed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I am always interested in any observations which the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] offers. He has taken opportunity to express his position in reference to the military and naval policy proposed by the President, and I believe it a good opportunity briefly to state mine.

I stand with the President in his desire for an efficient Army and Navy, such an Army and Navy as are demanded by our national responsibilities, our national rights, and our national existence. We can not blind ourselves to the fact that force is still the final arbiter among the nations. To be without the means of utilizing sufficient force to defend our rights among the nations, our national integrity, and to repel aggression is to court humiliation, misery, oppression, and defeat.

Now, what is the situation? We have said, through the Monroe doctrine, to the already overcrowded nations of Europe that they shall not establish colonies, acquire territory, or extend their system on the Western Hemisphere, with its spacious reaches of rich and undeveloped resources, and this position will arouse increasing antagonism and opposition.

We have said, through our immigration laws and some of our State land laws, to the greater part of Asia—the most populous division of the globe—that its peoples can not have the rights of citizenship in our country, that they can not even come to this country, except as students or visitors, and already this attitude has brought us on one occasion to the very verge of war with Japan. A large portion of our Mexican border is in a state of uncertainty and turmoil, and it is impossible to predict what developments may there occur or how long this condition may continue. It is a well-known fact that last fall we did not have in the entire United States a force half strong enough to cope with conditions on this border.

Furthermore, we have the Philippines, Hawaii, and the Panama Canal. Their protection and defense are imperative.

Again, we are a great exporting Nation, and it is absolutely essential to our economic existence and prosperity that our great export products, such as cotton, wheat, and so forth, have fair treatment on the high seas and in the world markets. In view of these facts, it would be folly to say that we are immune from war. In view of these facts it would be madness, as I view it, not to profit by the lessons of the European war in putting our land and sea forces on an efficient and modern basis.

The first lesson of the European war is the necessity of having sufficient reserve supplies of ammunition and equipment to meet an attack, and attacks generally come suddenly. The President proposes to put our coast-defense fortifications on a proper and secure basis and to acquire sufficient material and equipment for a land force of about 500,000 men. He does not propose a permanent, regular force of 500,000 men, but it is his opinion that we should have sufficient material and equipment on hand for an army of that size.

The President proposes an increase in the Regular Army of 38,000 men, bringing the total to 141,000, a total that will give us a mobile army in continental United States of only about 50,000 men.

In addition, he proposes to ask that a maximum of 133,000 men a year for three years agree to enlist for a military training course of one or two months in each of the three years, the men and officers of this volunteer force to be paid on the same

basis as the Regular Army while in training. They will then be furloughed for three years, with no other obligation than to return to the colors in the event of war or the imminence thereof. This volunteer force has been called the continental army. There is nothing compulsory about it, and if less than 133,000 men respond each year the Government will take them and do the best it can. The total number asked for per year is an average of about 120 men to each congressional district. These volunteers will be trained in their own section of the country.

The Navy plan contemplates such increase as will give us a total strength of 35 capital battleships in five years, with the necessary subsidiary ships. The Secretary of the Navy says that this will in all probability make us third among the nations in naval strength, England being first and Germany second.

The safest insurance against militarism and despotism in our Republic is to have the facilities for national defense on hand and readily available. If we do not have these in ready shape, it will be difficult to assemble them under stress of emergency without centralizing power and imperiling constitutional guarantees. In view of what Europe is suffering, we should congratulate ourselves that we have escaped so far, and should gladly pay the necessary cost of preparedness against war. Nothing will be more effective in preventing war, in securing our contentions and our rights, than knowledge on the part of the world that we are in position to utilize and mobilize in a reasonably quick time an adequate and effective land and sea force.

In raising the necessary funds I am in favor of an inheritance tax, of increasing the income tax, especially on the larger incomes, of an excise tax on munitions of war, and of an excise tax on alcoholic liquors equal to the protective tariff they now enjoy. The necessary funds can easily be raised in this way. As long as we have intoxicating liquors let them be heavily taxed. When they are abolished, as I am sure they will be, the inheritance and income taxes can be so laid as to take the place of the liquor tax. On men like Astor, the baby baron, who have acquired foreign citizenship while their incomes are derived from property protected by this Government, I am in favor of making the income tax double what it is on our own citizens.

I do not understand that the President insists on any particular method of taxation in raising the needed funds except as to an increase of the income tax.

I do not see anything approaching militarism in the President's plan. I am in favor of adequate appropriations for necessary defense, but not one cent for militarism or aggressive war.

I am in favor of the most rigid supervision of all contracts for munitions and supplies in order that exorbitant profits may be prevented, and of the manufacture by the Government itself, to the greatest extent practicable, of these munitions and supplies. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am not in favor of compulsory service.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, no doubt there are many citizens of the United States who have business interests in the Philippine Islands and who would therefore like to see the islands permanently retained by the United States.

The American people as a whole, however, believe that the Filipinos should finally have independence. Few advocates of permanent retention by the United States have appeared to express their views or assert a justification for their position.

During the present discussion the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and others have demonstrated conclusively that the Democratic position on this subject is in favor of granting the Filipinos independence as soon as that can be done with due regard to the interests of our wards as the controlling factor.

While there is some variation in the language contained in the platforms adopted by the Democratic Party in 1900, in 1904, in 1908, and in 1912, no one can fairly resist the conclusion that it is the established policy of our party to permit the Philippine people to establish and maintain their own government upon such principles and policies as in their own opinion will best conserve their happiness and promote their progress. There have been no specific declarations by any political party in the United States against final independence for the Philippines. That policy, if it exists at all in the minds of any of our citizens, is prompted in part at least by selfish financial and commercial considerations, and if fostered or cultivated at all this is done half secretly rather than aggressively.

It seems to be the general conviction of the American people, expressed in speeches in Congress and in political campaigns, in newspaper and magazine articles and in platform addresses, that the permanent domination of the Philippine Islands by the United States is contrary to the spirit of our political institutions, which are based upon the principle that

all peoples should enjoy the right of self-government when they choose to assert that right. The general state of the public mind favors early independence for the Philippines, because our administrative agencies are not peculiarly or specially designed or adapted to the control of dependent Provinces and peoples.

The danger of involving the United States in Asiatic politics through the activities of our Government in the Philippines has been discussed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. When either of these Senators discusses a subject little remains to be said for the cause he espouses. When both of them present substantially the same conclusions, no room is left for opposing arguments. I may be pardoned for adding to what they have said on this particular phase of the question my own assertion that it is the general public opinion that the permanent retention of the Philippines would inevitably involve the United States in Old World controversies, and that our possessions and control of the islands has not added cordiality to our relations with any foreign power. This opinion of the public is the result of general circumstances and conditions rather than the product of specific knowledge touching the subject, but it is nevertheless entitled to consideration in dealing with this subject, for, after all, abstract truth has little influence in controlling the conduct of individuals or of nations. Both are actuated by what they believe to be the truth, and so far as consequences are concerned prejudice is often more powerful in controlling the fate of nations than intelligence. However, I believe that this general conviction of the public that our possessions in the Philippines constitute a menace to our own peace is founded in both reason and fact, as has been established by the arguments of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. It seems, right there, that we all lose sight of a very important thought—that while the possession of the Philippines by the United States imperils the United States, it is equally true that so long as the Philippines are a part of our possessions that fact imperils the Philippine Islands. The very history of those islands proves that they would not have been touched by the American Government had they not been a part of the possessions of Spain.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was just about to come to that feature of the discussion.

Mr. CLAPP. Then I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator need not do so. He has expressed the thought better than I could express it myself. I was just about to say that the controlling factor in the consideration of this question is the interests and the rights of the Philippine Islanders themselves, and that the security of the islands from attacks may depend upon the relinquishment of control by the United States rather than the retention of it by the United States.

Another reason, akin to the one that has been so aptly suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, justifying independence for the Philippines is found in the fact that the Filipinos themselves desire independence. This to me is a matter of emphatic importance. If I am correctly informed, the opinion predominates among the Filipinos that they are ready for self-government. When I review the history of the struggle for independence throughout the world, begun by the founders of this Republic and taken up by other peoples inspired by their example, I am convinced that this desire of the Filipinos for independence should be given great weight and should be recognized.

In this connection I refer to the oft-repeated argument that the Filipinos are not "competent" for self-government. I do not undertake, in this brief address, to discuss the question of what constitutes "competency" for self-government. Incompetency for self-government is the one argument into which all others resolve themselves against granting liberty and self-government to the Philippine people. It is true that the civilization of the Philippines differs in many respects from ours, but the same may be said of almost every other people on the globe. Race and climate and other conditions create distinguishing features in all civilizations, which are reflected in their social and political institutions. Who is the judge of when a people is competent for self-government? I assert that history vindicates the conclusion that a people must be the judge of their own capacity, and that to constitute any other nation the sole judge of when a people is or becomes competent for self-government is the basest sort of tyranny, the very source of all forms of oppression. Since, then, the Filipinos assert their right and capacity to govern themselves, according to the standards of liberty fixed by history we should accept their judgment rather than insist upon our own.

In my opinion there is only one reason why the Filipinos should not have immediate independence, and that reason is founded solely on expedience and convenience both to the Filipinos and to our own Government and people. Immediate independence would leave the islands in some respects in a state of confusion socially, politically, and industrially. It is therefore wise to take time for adjustment, to anticipate in so far as that can be done controversies and complications which would arise if independence were immediately granted, and to adjust them as fairly and as fully as possible in advance. This relates to many subjects and particularly embraces the property rights of American citizens in the islands. It would seem that two years is adequate for this purpose. It is certainly better to fix some specific time and thus settle all disputes as to our present and future policy in dealing with this subject.

This amendment has a peculiar value at this particular time. It is calculated to have an excellent moral effect on world politics. It will demonstrate the good faith, the sincerity of our pretensions to use the power of this Government primarily for the benefit of the Filipinos themselves, and emphatically contradict the implication that the real purpose of the United States in the Philippines is the exploitation of their resources for the benefit of selfish Americans. We have had many vexing questions to solve during recent years in connection with our foreign relations. Some of the most difficult are still pressing us. To declare now the policy of granting independence to the Filipinos at a fixed time will tend to strengthen the confidence of other nations in our declarations of unselfishness, and will materially aid in the peaceful and proper solution of the very difficult problems now confronting this Government in connection with conditions existing and incidents transpiring in Mexico.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator refers to this amendment as one that gives a fixed date for independence. I know the frankness and intelligence of the Senator. I should like to ask him how he reconciles the provision that the then President of the United States at the end of four years shall decide whether the provisions of the bill shall go into effect or not. It has occurred to me in reading this amendment, which, of course, has been submitted to the Senate for only two days, that far from making any definite decision of the question the introduction of that provision tends to confusion, to uncertainty, and to leave the whole matter that is involved entirely indefinite instead of being definite. It proposes at the end of four years to leave to the decision of one single man, of what political faith nobody now knows, whose opinion in regard to this particular subject nobody now knows, the solution whether or not the provisions of this bill shall really go into effect. It would seem to me, and I would be glad to have the opinion of the Senator upon the matter, that it would lead to great confusion.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment in the form which it is now presented provides that if, in the opinion of the President, at the expiration of the four-year period it shall be necessary or advisable for him to do so, on account of new or changed conditions, he can again submit the question to the Congress convening next after the expiration of the four-year period. But if Congress should fail to repeal or modify this legislation, the Filipinos would automatically acquire independence.

That provision does, in a measure, as suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, diminish the effectiveness or revokes the feature of the bill granting independence within a definite time, but, in my judgment, that is no valid objection. Since the period of four years is allowed for the adjustment contemplated by the amendment and since new conditions are constantly arising, it may not be objectionable to give that power to the President, who is charged with negotiating with foreign nations interested in the subject for the neutrality of the islands.

It can not, I repeat, be objectionable to give the President that authority. I do not regard it as of the greatest importance and I would vote very cheerfully for the amendment without that feature.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from Arkansas has referred to the external features of that provision, but the provision also instructs the President to take consideration of the internal condition of the Philippine Islands. He will have the great responsibility upon his shoulders of deciding whether at that time the civilization of the people of the islands is sufficient to answer the provisions of the bill. It is a very great responsibility to put on the shoulders of a single man.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is, indeed, a great responsibility, but this provision enables the President to share that responsibility with Congress, if he desires to do so, and in that sense it can not be objectionable to me.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does not the Senator from Arkansas think it will leave the Filipinos in a state of great doubt as to what their future condition is to be?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think so.

Mr. LIPPITT. Suppose—

Mr. ROBINSON. I have great respect for the opinions of the Senator from Rhode Island, and I imply from his statement that it would suggest a great doubt as to what the prospect for independence would be, but I think that the purpose of Congress will, beyond any material question, be carried out, and that the result of this legislation as it is now proposed will be to grant independence to the Filipinos at the expiration of four years, if not before.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I ask the Senator what he thinks would be the result of this provision if somebody of the opinion in regard to the Philippines that is entertained by ex-President Taft, for instance, should be elected President at the next election?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, there is no use of discussing impossibilities. It is not within the range of probability or possibility that anything so unfortunate as that would happen to the American or the Filipino people; but if that should transpire, the responsibility would finally be upon Congress.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If, as the Senator seems to indicate, there is objection to this provision because it does not fix a day certain, is the Senator willing to make it a day certain?

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I think the policy in regard to the Philippine Islands should be one of two things. It should either positively grant their independence on a day certain, or it should positively state that it is the purpose of the United States to carry on the policy that for the last 15 years has been of such unchallenged and unparalleled success that even the present Democratic Governor General of the islands has praised it in the most extravagant terms. I think that a half-and-half policy in connection with the Philippines is the most indefensible position that this body can take.

So when the Senator asks me that question, I answer with perfect frankness that my first choice in regard to the Philippine Islands is to help equip them for self-government. I think success in that is probably quite within our reach; but my second choice is to relieve them from all doubt of our future relation and have the courage of our convictions, which this bill has not, and say positively that we are going to do such and such a thing at such and such a time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I merely want to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The answer to that is that this bill provides that while the President at the end of four years may take into consideration the situation at that time he has no power to prolong it longer than the adjournment of the Congress succeeding that time.

Mr. LIPPITT. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. If no action is taken it is absolute independence at the end of five years and six months.

Mr. LIPPITT. If gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber had a thorough conviction as to the advisability of this step they would not leave it to the decision of a man who perhaps would be a President hostile to their policies to decide. If they were certain that the doctrine they were trying to put into legislation would be followed by success, if they were certain that the conditions in the Philippine Islands as a result of this legislation would not be as they are in Mexico to-day, they would not put a string on this policy. They hope it will be beneficial, but are so doubtful about it that they hedge by putting the ultimate decision in the hands of a single man instead of settling it in Congress where the duty of decision belongs.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island recognize that to-day it is in the hands of a single man? He can not reverse this policy at the end of 18 months, but after four years automatically the sovereignty of the United States ends.

Mr. ROBINSON. Unless Congress shall in the meantime legislate to the contrary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Therefore it is not in the hands of one man. At the most it is in the hands of the Government.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, I simply invite attention to the duty of the President of the United States at the expiration of four years. If he decides that this independence is to be granted he decides what the policy of the United States will be. If he decides that it is not to be granted he throws the entire question open again for discussion. Upon what he does at the expiration of the four years will depend the future of the Philippine Islands, and the policy can not be decided until those four years have elapsed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, by way of jest, I may say it is a matter of great disappointment to me that the Senator from Rhode Island has not changed his views since I have expressed mine concerning this important question. I had expected, of course, that he would yield his views when I began the discussion on this subject.

In addition to what has already been said on this proposition, the President is given power to resubmit this matter to Congress, and that is the sole effect of the provision. If before the Filipinos acquire their independence conditions have so changed that in the opinion of the Chief Executive of this Nation he is warranted in doing so, he may again call the matter to the attention of Congress, but if Congress does not recede from the position it now takes the independence of the Filipinos will be acquired automatically as the result of this legislation.

Mr. President, another reason for speedily granting independence is that it will shorten our defense line to grant the Filipinos independence and remove the cause of possible future controversies and conflicts. It is not my purpose now to discuss the subject of "preparedness." No one can seriously deny that the independence of the Filipinos will in the near future lighten our necessary naval and military burden. Surely this is an end to be desired. Whatever view we may take of the subject of preparedness and the necessity for a prompt increase in the Army and the Navy of the United States, the conclusion is inevitable that the military burdens of this Government are already great and are destined to increase.

The difficulty of granting independence will increase with time. Every year that passes will witness the formation of new ties binding us to the Filipinos—ties of a social, a political, and an industrial nature. New business enterprises in which Americans are vitally interested are constantly springing up in the islands, and these will strengthen the influences which will seek to compel their retention. It is therefore better now to declare as definitely as may be our political policy toward the Philippines, and that is exactly what this amendment seeks to accomplish.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has expressed some apprehension as to the effect of the clause designed to secure the neutrality of the islands for a fixed period by treaty agreements. In order to afford the Filipinos that opportunity for the enjoyment of liberty which the United States has earned for them it seems necessary to secure them from molestation for a reasonable time. In the opinion of many who have studied this question, it is the duty of the United States to do this as a complement to independence. There can be, it would seem, little objection to sharing this responsibility with other nations, and at the worst the burden upon the United States would not be increased if other nations agreed to also guarantee the independence of the Philippines when granted or recognized by our Government. In answer to the suggestion that such an arrangement would involve us in "entangling alliances" with other powers, it may be said that in a sense this is true of every treaty that we make. Our entry into the Philippines may have been a policy in conflict with the recognized principles of the early fathers of this Republic. But we can not now escape the responsibilities which are the natural outgrowth of that policy. The enforcement of such a treaty and its observance would rest upon the same basis as would the observance and enforcement of the stipulations of any other treaty. Those suggest questions which may never arise and which will be dealt with fairly and conscientiously if occasion requires. The obligation is now upon us to protect the Philippines and it certainly would not be increased but would probably be diminished if other nations solemnly assume to share that burden. Public opinion in the United States seems to me to support the proposition that a guarantee of neutrality should accompany independence. The opinions of others who have devoted more attention to the subject may be of greater value than those of one whose duties here have not called him to a particular inquiry concerning this question.

It has been demonstrated to my satisfaction during the course of this debate that the Philippine Islands are not profitable

possessions when the subject is considered from a purely selfish standpoint. Of course this is not now and can never become a controlling factor in determining our course toward a weaker people. This Republic is consecrated to the promotion of liberty and justice and, we will not, we must not, destroy or neutralize the wholesome effect of our occupation of the Philippines by dominating them in our own interests.

The time is at hand when we may with honor secure to the Filipinos the boon of liberty, and by the adoption of the pending amendment this gratifying result will be assured.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the pending amendment, but merely to make a suggestion or two with respect to it by way of amendment. I do so at this time that it may go into the Record, and I invite the considerate attention of the chairman of the committee and his colleagues and the Senator from Arkansas to the matter I am proposing.

A good deal of time has been taken in the consideration of this bill in discussing subjects wholly foreign to it and of some things that are related to it only in a somewhat remote way. I suppose the subject of preparedness has some relation to this subject. I have no thought now or hereafter during the consideration of this bill of expressing any views on the subject of military preparedness further than to say, which I do now, that in my opinion at the conclusion of the decimating war now raging in Europe there will be less likelihood of any great nation attacking us than for the last 50 years and a greater likelihood of peace so far as this country and the great nations of Europe are concerned. In saying that I do not wish to be understood as intimating that I am antagonistic to a reasonable preparedness. I think there is less occasion now for alarm from that source than before this war began.

Mr. President, the Senate is engaged upon a very serious and important business. This amendment proposes in a way to grant independence to the Philippines. It is proposed that we withdraw from all connection with the Philippines. As I have heretofore remarked more than once, with that general purpose I am in very hearty sympathy, but there are right ways and wrong ways, safe ways and unsafe ways of doing a business of this kind.

I can not but feel that this grave question ought not to be disposed of until Senators and everyone who shall have a voice in its disposition shall be well satisfied in his own mind that he knows, or is confident that he knows, what the effect of the thing to be done is likely to be. We ought not to enact legislation of this kind with undue haste. So far from that it ought to be done with the most careful and painstaking deliberation.

I did not see the last draft of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas until the Senate met at noon. During the day, more or less occupied with duties that demanded my attention, I have been able to give the amendment only a somewhat casual examination. In going over it I have written some amendments to it. I am not sure that the amendments will make it better or worse. I feel, Mr. President, that I ought to be sure in my own mind at least before I propose seriously, or propose at all, unless it be merely by way of suggestion, any amendment to the pending proposition.

There are just one or two of these ideas that I have attempted to formulate that I wish to put in the Record, as I have stated, with the hope the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the chairman of the committee, and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] especially may examine them and give the Senate the benefit of their mature judgment; and also the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and others who have interested themselves especially in this legislation. I am not going to stop now to undertake to go into the matter in detail. It would be a little difficult for me to make myself understood unless Senators had the amendment before them and followed the reading. They can do that later.

Mr. President, I make this suggestion of an amendment to the so-called Clarke amendment. After the word "Philippines," in the twenty-first line, page 3, of the amendment, strike out the period, substitute a semicolon, and insert:

or if the President shall be unable to make a treaty or other binding agreement in the form hereinbefore stated with any of the said-mentioned principal nations, then to invite the cooperation of said nation or nations so refusing to enter into such form of treaty or agreement to make each for itself a treaty or convention with the United States obligating and pledging itself to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines and the government thereof.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator will yield for a moment, I will state that it seems to me a clause of that kind is very wise. There was a period of time when the Hawaiian Islands were the subject of controversy between various nations. England had them for a time, and Daniel Webster obtained an agreement with France and England that neither of those countries would

assume sovereignty over those islands, and it was absolutely respected as long as they remained an independent government. If we can not get the neutrality agreement in the sense of defending the Philippines with arms, we could have a negative defense in the way that they would not themselves attempt to subjugate the islands.

Mr. STONE. The text of the amendment is to this effect:

Immediately upon the passage of the act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines.

It might be that some of these nations who are interested in that region of the world, it might be that all of them, would refuse to enter into a solemn compact or convention pledging themselves to use force if need be, for that would be the meaning of it, to maintain the political integrity and independence of the islands.

I have submitted an additional clause, an alternative clause, to which I ask the attention of the gentlemen in charge. I am not going to discuss it now; I merely wish to get it before them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Do I understand that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri intends that this guaranty shall be obtained before we shall surrender authority? The amendment as it is now drawn leaves that to be acted upon after they have left our jurisdiction and when we have no control over them. Does the Senator think that that would be an opportune time to secure an agreement of that kind?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I intended to touch upon that. I do not think what I have suggested exactly touches that question, but I think it an important question.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator if he does not himself believe that it would be better to get any kind of an agreement concerning the future of the Philippine Islands while they are still in our possession and while it would be pertinent for us to secure such an agreement rather than after they have left our authority and ceased to be a part of our territory? It might be regarded as impertinent on our part then to ask any foreign Government to enter into an agreement with us to protect an independent government.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a moment later, after I had suggested one or two amendments, I intended to ask the Senators who are collaborating, I presume, in the preparation of this amendment to consider the very question suggested by the honorable Senator from North Dakota. It seems to me to be very important indeed.

If any nation should enter into an agreement with us of the nature we have in mind, we may well depend upon this, that, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has stated, such nation or nations are not apt to make such agreement with us after we have withdrawn our sovereignty over the islands, recognized a government established by the people there as an independent nation, and have sent our accredited representatives to that Government. Far more apt would such nations be to look with favor on an invitation of the kind suggested in the amendment if extended before the sovereignty of the Philippines was established and recognized; aye, more apt still to look with favor upon such an invitation if our recognition of the independence of the Philippines in some way depended upon the entering into agreements or conventions in advance of such recognition.

Mr. President, I believe that the language of this amendment, though well thought out and though it embodies in the main a policy I approve and have long advocated, might be changed so as to accomplish the result more certainly than to leave it as it is, and in this connection I throw out this observation: The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and that offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which is an amendment to the amendment, limits the neutralization, so called, of the islands to a period of five years from the date of the recognition and the withdrawal of our authority over them. I submit to Senators that it is not within, or hardly within, the range of probability—or possibility I came near saying, and I will say of possibility—that within five years after the United States has voluntarily abandoned the Philippines and withdrawn from the exercise of sovereignty over an area of such moment, some other nation

would go in, attack the Filipinos, and undertake to absorb them within five years.

Why, Mr. President, an act of that kind would be an act of such insolence, of such an offensive character, as would arouse the indignation of every American, and I do not believe any nation on the earth would venture to do it within so short a period.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that in the substitute that I have offered, to which the Senator has made reference, the language is "not less than five years." I thought it wise to give the President leeway for any term longer than five years.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will vote for the bill with the five-year limitation upon it if Senators desire to put it that way, making it the minimum or the maximum, or leaving it to the discretion of the President; but I would do so with the very greatest reluctance and apprehension. I am not going to discuss the matter now any further.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri to indulge me for just a moment.

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator; certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask if the Senator will permit me to request permission to insert in the remarks submitted by me a short time ago certain extracts from articles written by Filipinos, which go to show their capacity for understanding government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The fact that I have to leave the Chamber at this moment is the reason why I asked the Senator from Missouri to permit me to interrupt him.

Mr. STONE. I am very sorry that the Senator from Mississippi has to go, for I am about through, and he has been giving attention to this matter.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should be very glad to listen to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I should like the Senator from Mississippi to be present.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator just one other question right here?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would not the fixing of any date for the limitation be equivalent on our part to an admission that we would consent to the islands being seized at any time thereafter?

Mr. STONE. Well, I would hardly go that far—that it could be interpreted as a consent on our part; but it would, of course, have the effect of withdrawing our responsibility for in any wise interfering unless by a mere formal protest.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. The line of his argument and the question propounded by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] seem to involve an idea contrary to the one that I thought was intended to be worked out by those who are proposing this amendment. What we are attempting to do now is to get ourselves out of the Philippines as soon as possible, to wash our hands of all responsibility as to their independence, their mode of government, and so forth. It might aid us in extending independence to them to get the cooperation of other governments, but the responsibility is now on us, and it seems to me that whether or not the time when we declare their independence antedates the time when we ask the cooperation of other governments, our responsibility is in no wise lessened. This discussion seems to cause us to lose sight of the fact that our main object is to relieve ourselves of all responsibility in the Philippines as soon as may be.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I listen, of course, with interest to the suggestions of my friend from South Carolina, but I do not care at this time to be tempted into a discussion of this question. I am merely stating one or two things for the consideration particularly of the members of the committee. They may be of no value in their minds or of not sufficient value to induce them to make any change or suggest any change in the phraseology of the bill.

In line 23, on page 3, I suggest that the words "decline to do so" be stricken out, and that the words "decline to make or

enter into any or either form of treaty, agreement, or pledge hereinabove provided for" be inserted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the words "or fail" might be inserted in the Senator's amendment, so that it will read "decline or fail."

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I could not hear what the Senator from Missouri read. Would he object to again reading the clause which he wants inserted?

Mr. STONE. Of course I could read it again, but unless the Senator from Rhode Island was following me closely—

Mr. LIPPITT. I was following the Senator very closely; but would he let me read the amendment myself so as not to consume any time?

Mr. STONE. Certainly, I will hand the amendment to the Senator.

Mr. President, I am going to close with a brief reference to the closing paragraph of the Clarke amendment. As it appears in the pending amendment that paragraph reads:

If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

I would ask Senators—and I would have been glad to have had an expression from the author of this amendment if he were present, but for the moment he seems to be out of the Senate—what would be the effect if some of the nations, one or two of the nations, invited to join the United States in this suggested convention or treaty should do so and others should not? For example, let us suppose that Great Britain and Germany would consent to enter into such an agreement, but that Japan and France should decline to do so, what embarrassment would face the President in that situation?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I take it that that is one of the reasons why there is a reservation in the amendment as to a report being made to Congress before the expiration of the full four years. There is one year and about six months allowed for Congress to act with relation to the matter. The President can then report such suggestions with reference to it as he desires; and I take it that he would do so if only a few of the nations were willing to join in the arrangement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado is mistaken in that. The President is permitted to extend this four-year period only upon certain conditions. When I come to address myself to the amendment I shall point out that those conditions are inadequate and do not cover the conditions suggested by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, inasmuch as this matter of an international agreement with regard to the Philippine Islands is something that seems to be in the sole power of the United States Government to determine, the President at any time during the full period of four years, or during the period of a year and a half thereafter, could call the attention of Congress to and could secure the enactment of any legislation with relation to it that the situation at that time might demand.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have prepared hastily, and therefore imperfectly, several amendments to the text of the pending amendment; but with what I have said I believe I shall not further detain the Senate this afternoon, especially as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has expressed a wish to address the Senate.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I ask the Senator, merely detaining him a second, would he not ask to have his amendments printed in connection with the pending amendment, so that they might be seen as a whole?

Mr. STONE. I would do so if I had them in form.

Mr. LIPPITT. From the manner in which he stated them, I thought the Senator had them in the shape he desired.

Mr. STONE. No; I have simply written the amendments in the body of a copy of the pending amendment I have before me.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from Missouri takes his seat, or after he has taken his seat, if he will honor me with his attention, I should like to ask him one or two questions with regard to the meaning of the amendment, which evidently he has studied with care.

I call his attention now to the last clause on page 4. Suppose the President has, after the two years and before the expiration of the four years, recognized the government established in the Philippines and has been unsuccessful in securing the cooperation of any other nation in the guaranty that is

here proposed, is this act mandatory upon the President to enter into the guaranty that is here described, or is it within his discretion to do so or not?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I had supposed that if none of the nations entered into this proposed agreement or treaty the Government of the United States would be, in effect, under the text of the amendment, pledged to guarantee the independence of the islands, and that during that period it should continue to exercise the degree of authority set forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am, of course, speaking of the five years after the full recognition of independence or of the government established in the Philippines. The language of the amendment is:

And if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone.

I have been very much in doubt whether that language would require the President to give the guaranty or whether it would simply permit him to give the guaranty. If it simply permits him to give the guaranty, or authorizes him to give it, then we are allowing that question to be determined by the President alone, which is rather a vast discretion to impose upon the President.

Mr. STONE. However that may be, Mr. President, it is hardly worth while for the Senator from Iowa and myself to discuss that question, for if we are going to enter upon the policy outlined in the part of the amendment read by the Senator, then there ought to be no doubt, in my opinion, as to what the attitude of the Government of the United States is. I would not leave it as a matter of discretion to the President, and if the language is subject to a criticism of that kind it ought to be changed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that it ought not to be within the discretion of the Executive. While I am opposed to any guaranty of any sort after recognition and separation, yet, if we are to enter into the guaranty, it ought to be by the direction of the Congress and not through the will of the person who happens at that time to be President of the United States.

Mr. STONE. Of course, if I went into that I would have to discuss the subject at considerable length, which I am not desirous of doing at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to address the brief remarks which I have to make, which will only take me a few moments, both to the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

I think there are three very patent defects in the amendment which has just been discussed. The first is in the matter of securing a guaranty, the second is in the time of securing that guaranty, and the third is in the five-year limitation of our interest over the islands. Now, I want to put this in the form of a question to the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Nebraska: Why should we ask other nations to give a guaranty that they will join in the protection of the independence of the Philippine Islands? Would it not be far more easy for us to get a simple agreement of those nations that they would not interfere with the independence of the Philippine Islands, rather than an agreement that they would interfere with any other nation that should question their right to independence?

Suppose you adopt this provision in the form in which it now is, do you believe for one single moment, when you stop to consider it, that you could get an agreement, say, from Japan, or that she would enter into a guaranty, which would mean that she would wage war, if necessary, with another government in order to protect the independence of the Philippine Islands? Suppose, for instance, that Japan should reason along this line: "If Germany and America should get into war, the first act of Germany probably might be to attack the Philippine Islands. Now, if I enter into an agreement of this kind I must immediately become the ally of the United States to expel Germany from the Philippine Islands." Do you believe that Japan would enter into any such agreement, and do you believe that any other one of the great powers would enter into that agreement? Do you think you could get Germany to say, after we have left all control of those islands to the Filipinos themselves, that if Japan attacks those islands—and the moment Japan became involved in war with the United States, by the law of nations all treaty obligations between Japan and the United States would be abolished—do you imagine that Germany would enter into an agreement which would require her to say, "If Japan breaks the agreement or gets into war with the United States—which of itself would break that obligation—and attacks the Philippine Islands, we will become an ally of the United States in an attempt to get Japan out of those islands because she has guaranteed their independence?"

No, Mr. President, we will never get the guaranty of the great nations of the world to protect those islands from some other nation; but what we can do is this—and we would not be impertinent in asking it—we can say, just as I have indicated in a little amendment which I have presented:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world.

Then I provide that the President be authorized to enter into such an arrangement with the other powers of the world, conditioned that this country will not surrender her sovereignty until she knows that that sovereignty will be acquired by the islands and will be respected by the nations of the world.

While those islands are ours, it is very proper for us to ask other nations of the world, "Will you respect their independence if we grant them their independence?" When those islands cease to be ours, it would be an act of impertinence on our part to attempt to get other nations to enter into an agreement with us to respect their independence, and, much more for the reasons that I have mentioned, to guarantee the independence of those islands. So, if we are going to get any kind of an agreement, that agreement ought, first, not to be a guaranty, because we will never get that, and it ought not to contain a specific time limit, because the moment that we fix a time limit we indicate to them and indicate to the world that our interest in the welfare and independence of the islands ceases upon a given date. We do not want to say that to the world. What we want, and what the islands want, is their independence, and, in my candid judgment, the nations of the world will be glad to enter into an agreement that they will not interfere with those islands if we surrender our jurisdiction over them.

Five years from now! Why should you fix 5 years? Why should you fix 10 years or 20 years? When we have an agreement on the part of the nations of the world to let them alone, that is indefinite; and it will take a new contract in all good faith for that Government to make the agreement with us, and we will have two parties to the contract.

I think we may just as well eliminate from our minds now the idea that after we have surrendered those islands we will ever get any agreement from any nation in the world that they will go to war with us or against us in order to protect the independence of those islands, and I hope we will be able to make the modifications that have been indicated in the last amendment. I think my amendment is far preferable, because the very first act is to get the agreement. The moment we have that agreement from the principal nations of the world, then the President is to call a constitutional convention in the Philippine Islands. As soon as that constitutional convention is held, a republican form of government organized, an election held, and officers elected under that, so that they start upon their life of independence, then, by a proclamation, the President of the United States gives notice to the world that they are a free and independent people. It is simple of operation and sure of operation if we want to allow the Philippine people their independence.

I wish to grant it to them; but I say candidly that I do not want to vote for a bill that will give them their independence before that independence has been secured by some kind of an arrangement with foreign nations. I do not want a guaranty, because I know we can not get it. I do want a simple agreement to let them alone before we take our hands off of them. Then, and at that time, we can secure such an arrangement.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will not tie ourselves to any preconceived, hurried draft of any amendment without stopping to think what its effect is going to be, or make it a partisan question in any manner, but that if we really want to give them independence, if we really want to secure that independence, we will take a simple and straightforward way of securing it. If we want a guaranty or an agreement, it will have to be obtained while that is our territory, and not afterwards.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy with a part of the view entertained by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. If we are going to get any guaranty of any kind, I think it ought to be obtained before we declare the independence of the Philippines. But I want to suggest a thought to the Senator from North Dakota.

It strikes me as a very unusual thing for us to ask any nation to agree not to interfere with the Philippine Islands. Suppose some other nation had a dependency that they contemplated releasing their sovereignty over, and they should come to us and say: "Now, we want you to agree, before we release this dependency, that you will never take it over as a part of your sovereignty." We would naturally inquire what there

was in our past that would suggest the probability of our interfering with the sovereignty of a free and independent nation. On the other hand, there would be nothing that could be regarded as a reflection in our saying in advance to other nations: "We propose to surrender sovereignty over a people here that are not very well equipped for defense, and we invite you to join with us in a guarantee of their independence."

No nation could take any exception to that kind of an invitation, while it does seem to me that a nation would be inclined to take exception when we propose to surrender our sovereignty conditioned upon saying to nations that have shown so far no disposition to take the Philippines that we can not do it until they agree in advance that they will observe the independence of a free and independent country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to press that same argument home to him in a question?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose Great Britain should say: "Now, Canada would like to be a free and independent government. We desire to give her that independence, provided we feel satisfied that her independence would be respected, and we ask you to enter into an agreement with us that you will also recognize and respect the independence of Canada." I can see that that would be appropriate; but if Great Britain should ask us to guarantee the independence of Canada, I can very readily see that we would say: "No; we will not interfere with Canada's independence, but we will not attempt to guarantee it by the force of this country."

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it strikes me just the other way. Of course it is a delicate matter to talk about Canada, which is our neighbor; but I can understand how we could accept a suggestion from Great Britain that they proposed to separate from Canada, that Canada never had maintained any army or navy, was a peaceful country and unprepared for war, and "now we invite you, the United States, to join with us in an international agreement to maintain the integrity of Canada."

Of course I concede that it is going to be difficult to get any nation to agree to maintain the independence of a nation that is free, and of its own volition to get into involved propositions and conditions and situations that might invite war. But when we have lived side by side with these people, with nothing in our career—unless it is our recent exploitation of over-sea territory—that may have suggested to other nations that it is necessary to take a guaranty from us; it seems to me that it would not strike the people of the United States as a very agreeable proposition to have it suggested on the part of Great Britain that it would not do to sever her relations with Canada until she got an agreement from us that we would be decent and behave ourselves and not attempt the subjugation of Canada.

With this proposition of the Senator's we go to the other nations of the world, nations that have shown no disposition to interfere with the Philippine Islands, and we say, "We will let the Philippine Islands go if you will agree not to attempt to bring them under your own sovereignty." It strikes me that it would grate somewhat harshly upon any nation to say to them, in effect, "We would like to free these people, but before we can let them go we must have your guaranty that you will not try to subdue them."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I thought the Senator from Minnesota was about to refer to an episode in our own history. I ask him whether the inquiry he has just mentioned, made of other nations, would not be the equivalent of asking them not to do what we did in 1898 and 1899?

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I say with reference to Canada, the illustration of the Senator from North Dakota. We have gone on taking over-sea territory, and England might be justified, in view of that history, in asking from us that we would let Canada alone. But we make that same suggestion, then, to every nation that we invite to join in an agreement, not to guarantee with us and with one another the independence of the Philippine Islands but that they will be decent and fair and not themselves interfere with that independence. It does strike me that that would not appeal very strongly to the ordinary nation.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. While the Senator is discussing these contingencies, I should like to ask him what he thinks we ought to do in case we asked some of these nations, and some of them should decline to agree, not to interfere with the Philippine

Islands. Suppose we asked Japan, suppose we asked Germany and England, and all three of them refused to agree that they would not consider taking over the Philippine Islands. Would we then abandon our control and interest in the islands, and nevertheless maintain and extend the Monroe doctrine—which that practically amounts to—to such far-off countries as the Philippine Islands? Would the Senator approve of that?

Mr. CLAPP. I would approve of that, because if I were the Japanese Government and this country said to me, "We will release the Philippine Islands upon condition that you will agree not to take over their independence and make them a part of your sovereignty," I would say, "There is nothing in the history of this Nation to warrant any such suggestion," and I believe every nation would refuse to accept the suggestion involved in that kind of a request.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, does the Senator think that Germany, for instance, would be more likely to enter into an agreement with us that she would guarantee the integrity of the Philippine Islands against Japan than she would simply to enter into an agreement with us that she would not interfere with the independence of the Philippines?

Mr. CLAPP. I certainly think so; because what is there in the history of that empire to suggest that it is unsafe to launch a people here upon a free and independent career without first getting their guaranty that they will not seize upon that independent nation?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am speaking of the proposition of getting an agreement from Germany that she will guarantee the Philippine Islands against any encroachment of Japan.

Mr. CLAPP. As I said a moment ago, this proposition to get a guaranty of the other nations as to the integrity of the government of the Philippine Islands is a difficult proposition. For one, I do not believe in it; but I do think the nations would much more readily join in an invitation extended to them to come in together and guarantee collectively the independence of those islands. I think that would be far better than to go to these nations with the suggestion that "We can not let these islands go until we get a guaranty from you that you will leave them alone."

Mr. McCUMBER. But, Mr. President, if I may appeal to the Senator again, by the amendment which has been offered, we are saying this word not to one individual State but to all of them. They understand that before we cease our sovereignty or release it in any way we want an understanding with all of the countries. I confess that I can see no difference in the delicacy of the situation in asking all of the Governments to join with us in saying that they will refrain from any interference with the independence of the Philippine Islands and asking them to join together to go to war, if necessary, to protect the Philippine Islands against any country that should happen to be at war with us.

Mr. CLAPP. It is not so much an invitation to go to war. One is an invitation that appeals to the strength and the generous impulse of nations to help maintain the independence of these islands when we free them. The other is a suggestion that we, who took them once, will not now let them go until we get the guaranty of the other nations that they will not invade or take possession of the islands. One is an appeal to their generosity and to their strength. The other is the suggestion of a cupidty on their part that many of them, at least, have not done anything to warrant our suggesting.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and I give notice that beginning to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to take up the unfinished business immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, so that it may be pressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

FLOOD AT YUMA, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) for repair and rebuilding of the levee at Yuma, Ariz., and I direct the attention of the Senator from Arizona to the report.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. It is the same matter I had up this morning, to be perfectly frank with the Senate. I have taken a poll of the committee, and no objection is urged by any member of it, and it is signed by all the committee to whom I have presented it, with the exception of one member.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is the subject of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To appropriate \$50,000 to build a dam at Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am in favor of the joint resolution and have no objection to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1916.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Frank P. Trott, of Phoenix, Ariz., to be surveyor general of Arizona, vice Frank S. Ingalls, whose term expired January 22, 1916.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. James S. Dusenbury, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from January 18, 1916, vice Capt. Curtis G. Rorebeck; resigned January 17, 1916.

Second Lieut. Ralph E. Haines, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 18, 1916, vice First Lieut. James S. Dusenbury, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Camille Bringle to be postmaster at Wilson, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

I. V. Echols to be postmaster at Cotton Plant, Ark., in place of S. W. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

Pearl P. McCarroll to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark., in place of C. C. Cate. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1915.

CALIFORNIA.

Mary G. Mails to be postmaster at San Quentin, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1915.

COLORADO.

James A. Rutledge to be postmaster at Woodman, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

CONNECTICUT.

Daniel F. Finn to be postmaster at Jewett City, Conn., in place of William H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1916.

James W. Green to be postmaster at Eagleville, Conn., in place of A. E. Vinton. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

John F. Oates to be postmaster at Windsor Locks, Conn., in place of C. Leon Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Patrick L. Shea to be postmaster at Derby, Conn., in place of S. E. Chaffee. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

FLORIDA.

P. M. Elder to be postmaster at Sanford, Fla., in place of C. F. Haskins. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

GEORGIA.

H. J. Jolly to be postmaster at Cartersville, Ga., in place of Walter Akerman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1914.

Buford L. Heartsill to be postmaster at Dalton, Ga., in place of John A. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1916.

David A. Trundle to be postmaster at Ringgold, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

ILLINOIS.

Joseph S. Senglar to be postmaster at Woodriver, Ill., in place of S. S. Hubbard, resigned.

Molly Webster to be postmaster at Salem, Ill., in place of J. C. Utterback. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1915.

INDIANA.

Henry O. Eldridge to be postmaster at Lagrange, Ind., in place of E. B. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1916.

Vern Hahn to be postmaster at Wakarusa, Ind., in place of Frank Fletcher, removed.

IOWA.

George F. Althouse to be postmaster at Ackley, Iowa, in place of S. D. Breuning, resigned.

James Duggan to be postmaster at Melrose, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Harold H. Holmes to be postmaster at New Albin, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Charles F. Irons to be postmaster at Garrison, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Fred L. Ives to be postmaster at Hamburg, Iowa, in place of David D. Darby, removed.

Magnus A. Merkel to be postmaster at Keystone, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Carl Reinecke, jr., to be postmaster at Elkader, Iowa, in place of Vellus L. Gilje. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1915.

William B. Trullinger to be postmaster at Farragut, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Philip D. Switzer to be postmaster at St. Charles, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Thomas J. White to be postmaster at Whittemore, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Clyde L. Woods to be postmaster at Garwin, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

KANSAS.

George E. Bentley to be postmaster at Burr Oak, Kans., in place of E. C. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

Cecil Calvert to be postmaster at Quinter, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

Dorothy F. Derrick to be postmaster at Hugoton, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

T. J. Foley to be postmaster at Chapman, Kans., in place of J. A. Whitehair. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

Edward Grauerholz to be postmaster at Esbon, Kans., in place of J. J. Yapp. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1916.

W. L. Ringo to be postmaster at Girard, Kans., in place of T. R. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

KENTUCKY.

J. Walter Payne to be postmaster at Paris, Ky., in place of R. K. McCarney, deceased.

LOUISIANA.

Charlton Fort to be postmaster at Minden, La., in place of Charlton Fort. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1916.

Floyd C. Mitchell to be postmaster at Zwolle, La., in place of F. C. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expires February 13, 1916.

MAINE.

A. W. Willey to be postmaster at Cherryfield, Me., in place of M. J. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1916.

MARYLAND.

Southey King White to be postmaster at Salisbury, Md., in place of J. T. Truitt, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John P. McKay to be postmaster at Wellfleet, Mass., in place of E. I. Nye. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1916.

MICHIGAN.

Riley L. Compton to be postmaster at Rockford, Mich., in place of Neal McMillan. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Patrick F. Heenan to be postmaster at North Branch, Mich., in place of Albert Schell. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

MINNESOTA.

C. H. Day to be postmaster at Albert Lea, Minn., in place of T. V. Knatvold. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1916.

Julia A. Keefe to be postmaster at Morton, Minn., in place of Otis W. Newton, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

Coke B. Wier to be postmaster at Quitman, Miss., in place of Coke B. Wier. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1916.

MISSOURI.

Edverda Barnes to be postmaster at Pilot Grove, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Thomas P. Diggs to be postmaster at New Haven, Mo., in place of W. J. Godt. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1916.

MONTANA.

Mary E. Turrell to be postmaster at Drummond, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

NEW JERSEY.

F. J. Dushanek to be postmaster at Garwood, N. J., in place of Richard Watt. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

Paul F. Edwards to be postmaster at Newfield, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

Charles R. Grover to be postmaster at Atlantic Highlands, N. J., in place of L. S. Sculthorp. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

NEW MEXICO.

James W. Harmon to be postmaster at Melrose, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Skillman C. Hunter to be postmaster at Texico, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

NEW YORK.

Fay W. Amidon to be postmaster at Hilton, N. Y., in place of Minnie A. Daily. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Warren C. Brady to be postmaster at Brushton, N. Y., in place of A. B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Walter F. Brown to be postmaster at Remsen, N. Y., in place of John W. Prichard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.

Antoine N. Burton to be postmaster at Keeseville, N. Y., in place of Seraph E. Wolcott. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1916.

Henry J. Griffin to be postmaster at Bombay, N. Y., in place of C. R. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

E. J. Hanratta to be postmaster at Watervliet, N. Y., in place of Thomas C. Ross. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Ernest D. Joslin to be postmaster at Voorheesville, N. Y., in place of Frank Bloomingdale. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

James W. Larkin to be postmaster at Brockport, N. Y., in place of Burton H. Avery. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Thomas O'Brien to be postmaster at Carmel, N. Y., in place of S. G. Cornish. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1916.

John W. Rose to be postmaster at Arlington, N. Y., in place of J. W. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

George W. Runyon to be postmaster at Spring Valley, N. Y., in place of John S. Van Orden. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Ezra H. Welling to be postmaster at Monroe, N. Y., in place of Charles T. Knight. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Frank W. Miller to be postmaster at Waynesville, N. C., in place of Thomas L. Green. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

OKLAHOMA.

Alva P. Daniel to be postmaster at Commerce, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Ora E. McCague to be postmaster at Ralston, Okla., in place of Ora E. McCague. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

OREGON.

Walter L. Hembree to be postmaster at McMinnville, Oreg., in place of Hervey M. Hoskins. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1915.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Barrett to be postmaster at Clover, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

TEXAS.

Mrs. Ross Manning to be postmaster at Madisonville, Tex., in place of C. J. Davis, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Ida J. Garrison to be postmaster at Lost Creek, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1916.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles R. Williams to be United States attorney, district of the Canal Zone.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Robert M. Rawls, Athens.

GEORGIA.

R. P. Hicks, Wrightsville.

Albert C. Sweat, Nashville.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John A. Bell, Leicester.

Perry F. Brown, Northampton.

James F. Carens, Newburyport.

Arthur J. Coughlan, Maynard.

Edmund Daly, Hingham.

Joseph F. Murrman, Clinton.

William W. McLehose, Norton.

Thomas F. Meehan, Orange.

John P. O'Connor, Palmer.

Thomas A. O'Connor, North Easton.

Dennis T. Shea, North Scituate.

James E. Sullivan, Gilbertville.

William F. White, Mansfield.

NEW JERSEY.

John F. Sinnott, Newark.

NEW MEXICO.

Arthur F. Jones, Portales.

Edgar Savage, Elida.

NEW YORK.

Frank C. Sweeny, Valhalla.

Isaac W. Turner, Mount Kisco.

OHIO.

Frederick B. Mowery, Kingston.

OKLAHOMA.

John R. Reynolds, Hastings.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Benjamin H. Massey, Fort Mill.

Oecil S. Rice, Denmark.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 25, 1916.

F. H. Soll to be postmaster at Elkader, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With gratitude welling up in our hearts to Thee, O God our Father, for the gift of life and the splendid opportunities to grow and expand it to full and symmetrical proportions "till we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," we come to Thee for wisdom, strength, and courage, that we may meet the responsibilities of to-day, for it will pass and come no more again. In service to our fellow men is life and liberty, joy and happiness. A generous thought, a kind word, a helping hand is ours to give. "Let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not. As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men," and pass on our way in faith, hope, and love. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. To make a request for unanimous consent. My colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS], delivered an address at the dedication of a monument erected by an appropriation made by Congress, under the auspices and direction of the Fine Arts Commission, and I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing that address in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. EDWARDS] at a monument dedication. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the road bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of roads. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rivers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rivers. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE COMMON DEFENSE.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in the quietude of my garden last summer and autumn I reached certain conclusions which I have hesitated to express, thinking that I might modify them. But as time has gone on and events have occurred, it has seemed to me even more certain that my conclusions were right than when I first reached them; and I think, in justice to myself and, I hope, with some slight benefit to the country, I ought to express those conclusions to the House.

It is well known in the House that I never have been a believer in a large standing Army, and I suppose that probably I have been properly classed among those who are sometimes referred to as the "little-navy men." But wise men ought to be able to peer, maybe indistinctly, into the future and to prepare to-day for what may come to-morrow. The world is in the most anomalous condition which mankind has ever seen. The greatest struggle of all the ages is going on now between the most powerful forces of the human race, between great nations and combinations of nations, until we are the only large, powerful nation not yet involved in that struggle. It is a break-up in the world, each side fighting not merely for its own existence, as it believes, but, as it seems to me, each side fighting with the determination to put the other side, as it were, out of business. We have never had such a thing in the world before, with the same powerful influences at work.

The laws of civilization, international laws, the laws of humanity, are usually disregarded, at least more or less, when two great forces are fighting for mastery. When two men are fighting, each believing that he is fighting for his life, each determined to take the life of the other, neither one pays much attention to the desires, the requests, or the demands of some less powerful person not engaged in the conflict.

I do not know, and no one knows, what will result from the present war. No one knows whether the aggression on either side against our interests may possibly, against our desires and contrary to our wishes, finally lead us, perhaps not into this struggle, but into some struggle which is the outcome of this one. I doubt whether a paper peace between the two struggling parties now, even if it could be entered into, would be even the beginning of the end. I think the present conflict is liable and likely to last for many years before it is definitely determined either that one or the other is the master or that neither can become the master. And it seems to me that the part of wisdom for us is to prepare ourselves fairly for any possible trouble that may come. [Loud applause.]

It may be that we will have no trouble. I hope we may not. In this war I am neutral. I think we ought to maintain peace